

Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation and Peer Support Model Pilot: Initial Evaluation Report

February 2014

Evaluation Team:

Beverly Dretzke, PhD

Debra Ingram, PhD

Melissa Kwon, PhD

Kristin Peterson, MA

Timothy Sheldon, PhD

Kyla Wahlstrom, PhD

Research Assistants:

Anne Crampton

Shannon Dahmes

Kaitlyn Larabee

Alicia Lim



CENTER FOR
APPLIED RESEARCH AND
EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
+ HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Contact Information

Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement
College of Education and Human Development
University of Minnesota
1954 Buford Ave., Suite 425
St. Paul, MN 55108
Telephone: (612) 624-0300
Email: carei@umn.edu

Please cite as:

Dretzke, B., Ingram, D., Kwon, M., Peterson, K., Sheldon, T., Wahlstrom, K., Crampton, A., Dahmes, S., Laribee, K., & Lim, A. College of Education and Human Development, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement. (2014). *Minnesota state teacher development, evaluation and peer support model pilot: Initial evaluation report*. Retrieved from University of Minnesota website: <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/CAREI/>

Executive Summary

Minnesota Statutes 122A.40, Subdivision 8 and 122A.41, Subdivision 5 requires that districts begin evaluating teachers in the 2014-2015 school year. In response to the statute, the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) convened a work group in early winter 2011 to consult with the MDE Commissioner to develop a state model for teacher growth and development. In winter 2013, MDE released the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model (hereafter “Model”) and began planning for a pilot of the Model during the 2013-2014 school year (hereafter “Pilot”).

The Model consists of three components for evaluating teachers: 1) teacher practice, 2) student engagement, and 3) student learning and achievement. Sixteen school districts and one charter school from across Minnesota agreed to participate in the Pilot. Six of the districts are implementing the full Model (all three components) and nine districts are implementing one or two components (see Appendix I). The size of participating districts varies widely, from 287 students to 7,356 students.

In August 2013, the Joyce Foundation funded the University of Minnesota’s Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) to conduct an evaluation of the Pilot. This report summarizes results of surveys and interviews conducted with Pilot participants during November and December 2013 and is the first of three reports. The report for the entire Pilot year will be available in August 2014, and a final report, which will include information on the value-added assessments (an element of the student learning and achievement component) will be submitted to the Joyce Foundation in December 2014. The data in this report are preliminary and encompass only the first three months of the school year; thus, readers should not over-generalize the findings or conclusions presented here. The purpose of this interim report is to provide formative feedback to MDE.

Data Sources and Response Rate. The data collected for this report are drawn from online surveys and in-depth interviews of summative evaluators (usually principals, other school administrators, and district leaders) and teachers. The summative evaluator survey was administered as an online questionnaire in 14 of 17 pilot districts in November and December 2013. The overall response rate was 68% (25 out of 37). The response rate for individual districts ranged from 0% to 100%, with 12 of the 14 districts having a response rate of 50% or greater. The teacher survey was administered in 14 of 17 pilot districts in November and December 2013. The overall response rate was 41% (293 out of 723). The response rate for individual districts ranged from 17% to 82%, with 8 of the 14 districts having a response rate of over 40%.

Fourteen summative evaluators were interviewed across eight districts in November and December 2013, and 40 teachers were interviewed across eight districts in the same time frame. A range of experience was represented, from first-year teachers to veteran teachers with 37 years of experience. There was an even distribution of elementary and secondary teachers who were interviewed (17 elementary, 17 secondary, and 10 middle school, with some overlap) along with a balance of classroom teachers and subject specialists.

Initial Findings

Training and Technical Support. On the whole, the summative evaluators were very impressed with the quality of the MDE trainings. They expressed a high level of satisfaction with the presentations, although they reported that the amount of information tended to overwhelm their teachers. Teachers echoed a similar sentiment in their interviews, expressing a desire to have training topics broken into shorter sessions.

Eighty-six percent of teachers stated they attended the MDE training and 55% of those respondents stated that the MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing their Individual Growth and Development Plan. The majority of teachers, 77%, referenced the Handbook and reported it provided adequate guidance while working on their Individual Growth and Development Plan.

Implementation of the Pilot. Teachers expressed support for the way in which the Model and a statewide teacher evaluation system in general serves as a stimulus for districts to provide professional development. At the same time, teachers also expressed serious concerns about the sustainability of the Model with the limited funds available for professional development and release time for peer reviewers. Teachers noted the heavy burden placed on principals as summative evaluators.

Comments that came out in interviews with summative evaluators acknowledged that their own enthusiasm in implementing the Model had a strong positive effect on the perceptions of faculty and staff about the Model.

Individual Growth and Development Plan. Almost all teachers, whether surveyed or interviewed, reported that they had made some progress toward completing their Individual Growth and Development Plans, although more than half the teachers described their work as partially complete. About two-thirds of teachers surveyed found the performance standards rubric useful for identifying areas for professional growth, and an equal number of teachers responded that it was an effective tool for identifying areas of instructional practice that could be evaluated. Teachers interviewed found the Individual Growth and Development Plan form to be clear, and for many, it was familiar because they had written similar growth plans in the past. Most teachers consulted with at least one colleague while developing their Individual Growth and Development Plan and reported this collaboration as helpful.

Points of Contact. Half of the summative evaluators surveyed and interviewed indicated that they had planned their points of contact. This was consistent with the responses from teachers about points of contact with summative evaluators. Fewer than half of summative evaluators had completed any points of contact at the time of the survey and interviews. Both summative evaluators and teachers expressed concern about the time necessary for completing points of contact going forward.

Over half of the teachers surveyed had decided on points of contact with their peer reviewers, and over one-third of teachers surveyed reported they had completed one point of contact with a peer reviewer. Again, both summative evaluators and teachers had concerns about the time needed to complete points of contact with peer reviewers. During interviews, teachers and summative evaluators alike expressed hopes for increased collaboration through the peer reviewer relationship.

Student Learning Goals. Summative evaluators whose buildings had selected school-wide Student Learning Goals found that the uniformity of the goal made developing and approving these goals manageable. In settings where there was a building-wide goal, summative evaluators had high completion rates with their teachers and expressed satisfaction with the process. Roughly half of the teachers surveyed and interviewed had either completed or made some progress on developing their Student Learning Goals. Over half of teachers surveyed indicated that they had benefitted from consulting with a peer reviewer while developing their Student Learning Goals. Interviewed teachers talked positively about how they used student data to set starting points and decide upon benchmarks.

However, many summative evaluators found that their specialist teachers and non-teaching staff struggled much more to adapt the Student Learning Goals for their situations. This frustration was echoed in the interviews with specialist teachers and non-teaching staff whose goals could not easily be connected to a wider building goal and whose number of students made designating Student Learning Goals a challenge.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey	2
Teacher Implementation Survey	18
Teacher Beliefs Survey	31
Summative Evaluator Interviews	33
Teacher Interviews.....	43
Summary	56
Appendices.....	58

Tables

Table 1. Number of teachers in your building(s) participating in the Pilot	3
Table 2. Grade levels housed in summative evaluator building(s)	3
Table 3. Number of teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans summative evaluators have reviewed and approved	4
Table 4. Number of hours summative evaluators spent reviewing and approving teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans	4
Table 5. Number of participating teachers for which summative evaluators have decided on points of contact.....	5
Table 6. Number of participating teachers for which summative evaluators have carried out any points of contact and completed a points of contact form	5
Table 7. Total hours summative evaluators have spent working on points of contact.....	6
Table 8. Number of teachers' Student Learning Goals forms summative evaluators have reviewed and approved.....	6
Table 9. Total hours summative evaluators spent working on teachers' Student Learning Goals forms	7
Table 10. Types of training and information sessions that took place for teachers participating in the Pilot.....	7
Table 11. Number of hours summative evaluators have spent in MDE information and/or planning sessions	8
Table 12. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending MDE summative evaluator training sessions	8
Table 13. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending MDE teacher training sessions	9
Table 14. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending district-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot	9
Table 15. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot.....	10
Table 16. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending PLC and/or grade level meetings related to the Pilot	10
Table 17. Total hours summative evaluators have spent developing these materials.....	11
Table 18. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating specialist teachers	11
Table 19. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating probationary teachers	12

Table 20. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating mid-career teachers	12
Table 21. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating late-career teachers	12
Table 22. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating part-time teachers	13
Table 23. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating teachers who teach in more than one school in the district.....	13
Table 24. Summative evaluators' overall satisfaction with the training received from MDE for the Pilot.....	14
Table 25. Summative evaluators' overall satisfaction with the communication they had with MDE staff regarding the Pilot.....	14
Table 26. Summative evaluators' overall satisfaction with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model	15
Table 27. Summative evaluators' rating of the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance.....	15
Table 28. Teachers' progress on their Individual Growth and Development Plans	18
Table 29. Teachers' progress on points of contact	19
Table 30. Teachers' progress on Student Learning Goals.	19
Table 31. Amount of time spent by teachers on the implementation of Model components	20
Table 32. Teachers' references while developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan.....	21
Table 33. Teachers' ratings on the usefulness of the Handbook and training in developing their plan and the perceived benefits of the process of developing their professional growth plans	21
Table 34. Teachers' consultants while developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan	22
Table 35. Other write-in responses for teachers' consultants while developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan	22
Table 36. Teachers' perception of whether or not it was beneficial to consult with someone when developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan	22
Table 37. Teachers' views on the difficulty level in developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan	23
Table 38. Teachers' views on the effectiveness of performance standards for teacher rubric	23
Table 39. Individuals whom teachers consulted with while developing their Student Learning Goals.....	24
Table 40. Teachers' perceived benefits of the consultants that were utilized in developing their Student Learning Goals	24

Table 41. Teachers’ ratings on the usefulness of the Handbook and training in developing their Student Learning Goals.....	25
Table 42. Teachers’ completion rates associated with the components of the Student Learning Goals.....	25
Table 43. Teachers’ views on the difficulty of developing their Student Learning Goals.....	26
Table 44. Methods that teachers reported they will use to assess Student Engagement	27
Table 45. Teachers’ overall satisfaction with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model.....	27
Table 46. Teachers’ rating of the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance	28
Table 47. Teaching level of teacher beliefs survey respondents.....	32
Table 48. Summative evaluator interviews by district/school	33
Table 49. Teacher interviews by district.....	43
Table 50. Characteristics of teacher interview participants	43

Appendices

Appendix A: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Instrument	59
Appendix B: Teacher Implementation Survey Instrument	65
Appendix C: Teacher Beliefs Survey Instrument	74
Appendix D: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Response Rate Information.....	77
Appendix E: Teacher Implementation Survey Response Rate Information	78
Appendix F: Teacher Beliefs Survey Response Rate Information	79
Appendix G: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Item Response Frequency Tables.....	80
Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Response Frequency Tables	92
Appendix I: Participating Districts Map	106
Appendix J: Summative Evaluator Interview Protocol.....	107
Appendix K: Teacher Interview Protocol	110

Introduction

Minnesota Statutes 122A.40, Subdivision 8 and 122A.41, Subdivision 5 requires that districts begin evaluating teachers in the 2014-2015 school year. In response to the statute, the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) convened a work group in early winter 2011 to consult with the MDE Commissioner to develop a state model for teacher growth and development. In winter 2013, MDE released the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model (hereafter “Model”) and began planning for a pilot of the Model during the 2013-2014 school year (hereafter “Pilot”).

The Model consists of three components for evaluating teachers: 1) teacher practice, 2) student engagement, and 3) student learning and achievement. Sixteen school districts and one charter school from across Minnesota agreed to participate in the Pilot. Six of the districts are implementing the full Model (all three components) and nine districts are implementing one or two components (see Appendix I). The size of participating districts varies widely, from 287 students to 7,356 students.

In August 2013, the Joyce Foundation funded the University of Minnesota’s Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) to conduct an evaluation of the Pilot. This report summarizes results of surveys and interviews conducted with Pilot participants during November and December 2013.

Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey

Method

Participants and Response Rate

The summative evaluator implementation survey was administered as an online questionnaire. All 17 districts were contacted for summative evaluator email address information. Fourteen of the 17 districts responded to the request, and, between November 20 and November 25, 2013, a link to the questionnaire was emailed to 37 summative evaluators representing these 14 districts. The number of summative evaluators receiving the survey per district ranged from one to seven. No summative evaluators elected to 'opt-out' of the survey, and all messages reached the addressees (no email bounces). On December 2, 2013, eight days after the initial email message, a reminder email was sent to 19 non-respondents. On December 16, 2013, the link to the survey was closed. The overall response rate was 68% (25 out of 37). The response rate for individual districts ranged from 0% to 100%, with 12 of the 14 districts having a response rate of 50% or greater (see Appendix D).

Survey Instrument

The questionnaire was designed to gather information on the summative evaluators' perspectives on the usefulness of the *Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook*, sources of support they received, level of support they received, progress towards completing specific tasks, and overall evaluation of the Model. Various six-point response scales were used to collect summative evaluator responses. The questionnaire also included items regarding background information about the building site including: number of teachers in the building, number of summative evaluators in the building, and grade level(s) housed in the building. In addition, one open-ended item at the end of the questionnaire provided the opportunity for summative evaluators to write any comments or suggestions they had regarding the Model. The survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.

Results of the Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey

The summative evaluators' responses represent their progress and thoughts three months into the first semester of the 2013-14 school year. Note that findings reported here are based on the response rate for each question. Detailed information regarding the summative evaluators' responses can be found in Appendix G.

Background

Most respondents indicated that there were either one (56%) or two (32%) summative evaluators in their buildings. Only 8% said that their buildings had four or more summative evaluators.

The summative evaluators reported that the number of Pilot teachers in their buildings ranged from 4 to 90, with a mean of 29.9 (SD = 21.4). Table 1 presents a grouped frequency summary of the number of Pilot teachers in the summative evaluators' buildings.

Table 1. Number of teachers in your building(s) participating in the Pilot (N=25)

No. of Teachers	Frequency	%
1-10	6	24.0
11-20	2	8.0
21-30	6	24.0
31-40	5	20.0
41-50	2	8.0
51-60	2	8.0
More than 60	2	8.0

Table 2 presents the grade levels that are housed in each summative evaluator's building(s). The responses represent 16 different grade-level combinations. The most frequently reported grade-level combination was PreK-12, with 5 of the 25 summative evaluators (20%) providing this response.

Table 2. Grade levels housed in summative evaluator building(s) (N=25)

Grade Level	Frequency	%
PreK-12	5	20.0
PreK-3	1	4.0
PreK-5, 7-12+ (transition)	1	4.0
K-2	1	4.0
K-5	3	12.0
K-6	1	4.0
1-3	1	4.0
4-6	1	4.0
4-7	1	4.0
5-7	1	4.0
5-8	1	4.0
6-12	2	8.0
7-12	2	8.0
8-12	2	8.0
9-12	1	4.0
9-12+	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

Individual Growth and Development Plans

Summative evaluators were asked questions about the work they had completed to date on their teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans. Ten summative evaluators responded to these questions. Responses regarding the number of plans that, to date, had been reviewed and approved ranged from 0 to 46, with an average of 14.1 (SD = 17.6). The most frequently occurring response, provided by four of the ten summative evaluators, was zero. Table 3 presents a grouped frequency summary of the number of plans that had been reviewed and approved.

Table 3. Number of teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans summative evaluators have reviewed and approved (N=10)

No. of Teachers' Plans	Frequency	%
0-9	6	60.0
10-19	0	0.0
20-29	1	10.0
30-39	2	20.0
40-49	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Responses regarding how many hours they had spent reviewing and approving their teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans ranged from 0 to 50 hours, with a mean of 12.4 (SD=16.8). The most frequently occurring response, provided by four of the ten summative evaluators, was zero hours. Table 4 presents a grouped frequency summary of the number of hours spent by summative evaluators reviewing and approving their teachers' plans.

Table 4. Number of hours summative evaluators spent reviewing and approving teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans (N=10)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-9	6	60.0
10-19	1	10.0
20-29	1	10.0
30-39	1	10.0
40-49	0	0.0
50-59	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Points of Contact

Summative evaluators were asked the number of teachers for whom they had arranged for points of contact. Ten summative evaluators responded to this question. Responses ranged from 0 to 64 teachers, with a mean of 19.4 (SD=23.8). The most frequently occurring response, provided by four of the ten summative evaluators, was zero. Table 5 presents a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 5. Number of participating teachers for which summative evaluators have decided on points of contact (N=10)

No. of Teachers	Frequency	%
0-9	5	50.0
10-19	1	10.0
20-29	1	10.0
30-39	0	0.0
40-49	1	10.0
50-59	1	10.0
60 and more	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Ten summative evaluators responded to the question: *For how many participating teachers have you carried out any Points of Contact and completed a Points of Contact form.* The mean response was 1.4 teachers (SD=2.7), and the range was 0 to 7. The most frequently occurring response was zero teachers, provided by seven of the ten summative evaluators (see Table 6).

Table 6. Number of participating teachers for which summative evaluators have carried out any points of contact and completed a points of contact form (N=10)

No. of Teachers	Frequency	%
0	7	70.0
1	1	10.0
2	0	0.0
3	0	0.0
4	0	0.0
5	0	0.0
6	1	10.0
7	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

When asked to estimate the number of hours they had spent working on points of contact, responses given by the ten summative evaluators ranged from 0 to 28 hours, with a mean of 9.9 hours (SD = 9.1). The most commonly occurring response was zero hours, provided by three summative evaluators. Table 7 provides a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 7. Total hours summative evaluators spent working on points of contact (N=10)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-4	3	30.0
5-9	2	20.0
10-14	1	10.0
15-19	3	30.0
20-24	0	0.0
25-29	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Student Learning Goals

The summative evaluators were asked how many teachers' Student Learning Goals they had reviewed and approved and how much time they had spent working on their teachers' Student Learning Goals. Responses regarding number of teachers' Goals reviewed and approved ranged from 0 to 40, with a mean of 6.7 (SD=12.4). The most commonly occurring response was zero, provided by 8 of the 17 summative evaluators who responded to the question. See Table 8 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 8. Number of teachers' Student Learning Goals forms summative evaluators you reviewed and approved (N=17)

No. of Teachers' Forms	Frequency	%
0-4	12	70.6
5-9	2	11.8
10-14	0	0.0
15-19	0	0.0
20-24	1	5.9
25-29	0	0.0
30-39	1	5.9
40-49	1	5.9
Total Respondents	17	100.1

Estimates of the total time they had spent working on teachers' Student Learning Goals ranged from 0 to 40 hours, with a mean of 7.9 hours (SD=10.9). The most frequently occurring response was zero hours, given by 6 of the 17 respondents. See Table 9 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 9. Total hours summative evaluators spent working on teachers' Student Learning Goals forms (N=17)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-4	10	58.8
5-9	1	5.9
10-14	2	11.8
15-19	1	5.9
20-24	2	11.8
25-29	0	0.0
30-39	0	0.0
40-49	1	5.9
Total Respondents	17	100.1

Communication and Training

The summative evaluators were asked several questions about communication and training. One of these questions concerned the types of training and information sessions related to the Pilot that took place for teachers. Eighty percent reported that teachers had participated in district-sponsored training sessions, 72% reported that teachers had participated in MDE training sessions, 72% reported that teachers participated in PLC and/or grade-level meetings, and 68% indicated that teachers participated in building-sponsored sessions. In addition, 8% stated that no training or information sessions related to the Pilot had yet taken place for the teachers in their buildings. See Table 10 for response frequencies.

Table 10. Types of training and information sessions that took place for teachers participating in the Pilot (Check all that apply) (N=25)

Responses	Frequency	%
District-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot	20	80.0
MDE training sessions	18	72.0
PLC and/or grade-level meetings related to the Pilot	18	72.0
Building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot	17	68.0
No training and information sessions indicated	2	8.0
Total Respondents	25	*

* Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option.

The summative evaluators were asked seven questions regarding the amount of time they personally had spent in various types of training and information sessions related to the Pilot. The summative evaluators' responses regarding time spent in MDE information and/or planning sessions ranged from 0 to 60 hours, with a mean of 18.3 hours (SD=15.1). The most frequently occurring response was 20 hours, provided by 5 of the 23 respondents. Table 11 provides a grouped frequency summary of the summative evaluators' responses.

Table 11. Number of hours summative evaluators spent in MDE information and/or planning sessions (N=23)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-4	5	21.7
5-9	3	13.0
10-14	1	4.3
15-19	3	13.0
20-24	5	21.7
25-29	0	0.0
30-34	3	13.0
35-39	0	0.0
40 and more	3	13.0
Total Respondents	23	99.7

The mean response regarding how much time they had personally spent attending MDE summative evaluator training sessions was 6.2 hours (SD=4.9). There was a tie for the most frequent response with five summative evaluators indicating they had spent zero hours and five summative evaluators reporting they had spent eight hours. See Table 12 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 12. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending MDE summative evaluator training sessions (N=23)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	7	30.4
3-5	3	13.0
6-8	7	30.4
9-11	3	13.0
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	2	8.7
Total Respondents	23	99.8

The mean response regarding time spent attending MDE teacher training sessions was 6.3 hours (SD=6.8). The range was 0 to 24 hours. The most frequently occurring response was zero hours, provided by 8 of the 23 respondents. See Table 13 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 13. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending MDE teacher training sessions (N=23)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	9	39.1
3-5	4	17.4
6-8	3	13.0
9-11	3	13.0
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	1	4.3
18-20	1	4.3
21-23	0	0.0
24-26	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.7

Responses regarding the time summative evaluators had personally spent attending district-sponsored sessions ranged from 0 to 75 hours, with a mean of 12.4 hours (SD=16.5). The most frequently occurring response was six hours, provided by three respondents. See Table 14 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 14. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending district-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot (N=23)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	4	17.4
3-5	6	26.1
6-8	4	17.4
9-11	1	4.3
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	2	8.7
18-20	2	8.7
21 and more	3	13.0
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Estimates of time spent attending building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot ranged from 0 to 25 hours, with a mean of 5.3 hours (SD=6.0). The most frequently occurring response was zero hours, provided by six of the summative evaluators. See Table 15 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 15. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot (N=23)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	10	43.5
3-5	4	17.4
6-8	4	17.4
9-11	3	13.0
12-14	0	0.0
15-17	1	4.3
18-20	0	0.0
21-23	0	0.0
24-26	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.9

The summative evaluators' estimates of time spent attending PLC and/or grade level meetings related to the Pilot ranged from 0 to 20 hours with a mean of 4.0 hours (SD=5.0). The most common response was zero hours, provided by 7 of the 23 respondents. See Table 16 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 16. Number of hours summative evaluators spent attending PLC and/or grade level meetings related to the Pilot (N=23)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	13	56.5
3-5	4	17.4
6-8	2	8.7
9-11	2	8.7
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	0	0.0
18-20	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Approximately two-thirds (65%) of the 23 respondents said that they had personally developed materials (e.g., memos, announcements) to inform teachers about the Pilot. The remaining one-third said they had not developed any materials. Summative evaluators were asked, as a follow-up question, to estimate the total hours they had spent developing the materials. Time estimates ranged from 0 to 20 hours. The mean number of hours spent developing materials was 5.0 hours (SD=5.5). See Table 17 for a grouped frequency summary of the responses.

Table 17. Total hours summative evaluators have spent developing these materials (N=17)

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	7	41.2
3-5	5	29.4
6-8	2	11.8
9-11	1	5.9
12-14	0	0.0
15-17	1	5.9
18-20	1	5.9
Total Respondents	17	100.1

Satisfaction with the Model

The summative evaluators were asked a series of questions about their satisfaction with the Model. Tables 19 through 24 below present summative evaluators' opinions of how well the Model works for evaluating specialist teachers, probationary teachers, mid-career teachers, late-career teachers, part-time teachers, and teachers who teach in more than one school in the district.

Evaluating specialist teachers. The summative evaluators indicated that they felt the Model was *poor* (30%), *fair* (30%), or *good* (30%) with respect to evaluating specialist teachers. No summative evaluators thought it was *very good* or *excellent*. See Table 18 for response frequencies.

Table 18. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating specialist teachers (N=23)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	7	30.4
Fair	7	30.4
Good	7	30.4
Very good	0	0.0
Excellent	0	0.0
N/A	2	8.7
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Evaluating probationary teachers. Overall, the summative evaluators thought the Model worked well for evaluating probationary teachers. The most frequent response was *very good* (44%), and no summative evaluators said it was *poor*. See Table 19 for response frequencies.

Table 19. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating probationary teachers (N=23)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	0	0.0
Fair	7	30.4
Good	3	13.0
Very good	10	43.5
Excellent	2	8.7
N/A	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Evaluating mid-career teachers. A majority of summative evaluators thought the Model was *good* (48%) or *very good* (35%) for evaluating mid-career teachers. See Table 20 for response frequencies.

Table 20. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating mid-career teachers (N=23)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	1	4.3
Fair	2	8.7
Good	11	47.8
Very good	8	34.8
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	0	0.0
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Evaluating late-career teachers. A majority of the summative evaluators thought the Model was either *good* (39%) or *very good* (39%) for evaluating late-career teachers. See Table 21 for response frequencies.

Table 21. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating late-career teachers (N=23)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	1	4.3
Fair	3	13.0
Good	9	39.1
Very good	9	39.1
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	0	0.0
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Evaluating part-time teachers. Summative evaluators' responses indicated that they thought the Model did not work as well for evaluating part-time teachers as it did for evaluating other categories of teachers. The 23 respondents who answered the question about part-time teachers rated the Model as *good* (30%) or *fair* (22%) for evaluating part-time teachers. See Table 22 for response frequencies.

Table 22. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating part-time teachers (N=23)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	2	8.7
Fair	5	21.7
Good	7	30.4
Very good	3	13.0
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	5	21.7
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Evaluating teachers who teach in more than one school in the district. The most common ratings given to the Model for evaluating teachers who teach in more than one school in the district were *good* (26%) or *fair* (22%). See Table 23 for response frequencies.

Table 23. Summative evaluators' perspectives of how well the Model works for evaluating teachers who teach in more than one school in the district (N=23)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	3	13.0
Fair	5	21.7
Good	6	26.1
Very good	3	13.0
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	5	21.7
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Overall Satisfaction

Finally, summative evaluators were asked to provide overall satisfaction ratings regarding training provided by MDE, communication with MDE, and the Model. They were also asked specifically to rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance. Tables 24 through 27 display summative evaluators' responses to these questions.

With respect to their overall satisfaction with training received from MDE for the Pilot, a majority of summative evaluators reported being *satisfied* (54%). See Table 24 for response frequencies.

Table 24. Summative evaluators' overall satisfaction with the training received from MDE for the Pilot (N=24)

Responses	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	3	12.5
Dissatisfied	3	12.5
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	1	4.2
Satisfied	13	54.2
Very satisfied	3	12.5
N/A	1	4.2
Total Respondents	24	100.0

Regarding their satisfaction with the communication they had with MDE staff regarding the Pilot, the summative evaluators were fairly equally divided among the responses of *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied* (29%), *satisfied* (21%), and *very satisfied* (29%). Fewer respondents indicated they were *very dissatisfied* (4%) or *dissatisfied* (8%). See Table 25 for response frequencies.

Table 25. Summative evaluators' overall satisfaction with the communication they had with MDE staff regarding the Pilot (N=24)

Responses	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	1	4.2
Dissatisfied	2	8.3
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	7	29.2
Satisfied	5	20.8
Very satisfied	7	29.2
N/A	2	8.3
Total Respondents	24	100.0

The summative evaluators were asked how satisfied they were overall with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model. Exactly half of the 24 respondents said they were *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied*. The responses of summative evaluators who indicated a level of satisfaction tended to be more somewhat more positive (29% *satisfied* or *very satisfied*) than negative (21% *dissatisfied* or *very dissatisfied*), a See Table 26 for response frequencies.

Table 26. Summative evaluators' overall satisfaction with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model (N=24)

Responses	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	1	4.2
Dissatisfied	4	16.7
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	12	50.0
Satisfied	5	20.8
Very satisfied	2	8.3
Total Respondents	24	100.0

The summative evaluators were asked how they would rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance. Of these 24 respondents, 8% responded *poor*, 25% responded *fair*, 38% responded *good*, 17% responded *very good*, and 13% responded *no opinion*. See Table 27 for response frequencies.

Table 27. Summative evaluators' rating of the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance (N=24)

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	2	8.3
Fair	6	25.0
Good	9	37.5
Very good	4	16.7
Excellent	0	0.0
No opinion	3	12.5
Total Respondents	24	100.0

Summary of Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Results

Progress to Date

Summative evaluators were asked a variety of questions regarding their implementation of the Model, including their progress in reviewing and approving Individual Growth and Development Plans, establishing and carrying out points of contact, reviewing and approving Student Learning Goals, participation in training/information sessions and PLC meetings, and their satisfaction with the Pilot and the Model. The summative evaluators' responses represent their progress and thoughts about the Model three months into the first semester of the school year.

Individual Growth and Development Plan. The summative evaluators were asked about the work they had done with teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans. A majority of respondents had reviewed fewer than ten plans and had spent an average of 12.4 hours reviewing and approving these Plans.

Points of contact. Half of the summative evaluators had decided on points of contact for some of their teachers. But seven summative evaluators (70%) had neither carried out points of contact nor completed any points of contact forms. The three remaining summative evaluators had begun to carry out points of contact with teachers and spent an average of 9.9 hours on this activity.

Student Learning Goals. Summative evaluators were also asked about the work they had done with teachers' Student Learning Goals. Fourteen summative evaluators (82%) had reviewed and approved Student Learning Goals for fewer than ten teachers. The mean response for hours spent by summative evaluators on teachers' Student Learning Goals was 7.9 hours.

Training and information sessions. When asked what types of training and information sessions related to the Pilot had taken place for the teachers in their buildings, 72% reported that there were MDE training sessions, 80% reported that there were district-sponsored sessions, 68% reported that there were building-sponsored sessions, and 72% reported that there were PLC and/or grade-level meetings.

Time spent attending and developing materials for training and information sessions. Summative evaluators reported having personally spent an average of 18.3 hours in MDE information and/or planning sessions, 6.2 hours attending MDE summative evaluator training sessions, 6.3 hours attending MDE teacher training sessions, 12.4 hours attending district-sponsored sessions, 5.3 hours attending building-sponsored sessions, and 4.0 hours attending PLC and/or grade level meetings. Sixty-five percent of summative evaluators reported developing materials to inform teachers about the Pilot and spending an average of 5.0 hours developing these materials.

Overall Satisfaction

The summative evaluators were asked questions about their satisfaction with the Model for evaluating teachers. Summative evaluators who responded to these questions reported that the Model is generally *good* or *very good* for evaluating mid-career teachers (83%) and late-career teachers (78%). However, they reported that it was not as effective for evaluating probationary, specialist, or part-time teachers or teachers who teach in more than one school in the district.

Lastly, the summative evaluators were asked about their satisfaction with the Pilot and with the Model. A majority of respondents reported being *satisfied* (54%) with the training provided by MDE. Regarding satisfaction with communication with MDE, responses were fairly evenly split among *neither dissatisfied*

nor satisfied (29%), *satisfied* (21%), and *very satisfied* (29%). Half of the respondents (50%) said they were *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied* overall with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model. When asked how they would rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance, the most frequent responses were *good* (38%) and *fair* (25%).

Teacher Implementation Survey

Method

Participants and Response Rate

The teacher implementation survey was administered as an online questionnaire. All 14 districts were contacted for the email addresses of teachers participating in the Pilot. Fourteen of the 17 districts responded to the request, and, between November 20 and November 25, 2013, a link to the questionnaire was emailed to 723 teachers representing these 14 districts. Four teachers elected to 'opt-out' of taking the survey, and five messages did not reach the senders (five email bounces). On December 2, 2013, eight days after the original email message, a reminder email was sent to 466 non-respondents. On December 16, 2013, the link to the survey was closed. The overall response rate was 41% (293 out of 723). The response rate for individual districts ranged from 17% to 82%, with 8 of the 14 districts having a response rate of over 40% (see Appendix E).

Survey Instrument

The questionnaire contained 39 questions designed to collect teachers' perspectives on the usefulness of the *Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook*, sources of support they had received, level of support received, progress towards completing specific tasks, and their overall opinion of the Model. Various six-point response scales were used to collect teacher responses. The questionnaire also included background information items regarding the grade level(s) taught during the 2013-14 school year, subject area, gender, number of years teaching in the district, and total number of years teaching. The survey instrument can be found in Appendix B.

Teacher Implementation Survey Results

Progress to Date

The questionnaire contained a number of items designed to assess teachers' progress with respect to completing tasks related to the Teacher Practice and Student Learning Goals components of the Model. The teachers' responses represent their progress three months into the first half of the school year. Detailed information regarding the teachers' responses can be found in Appendix H.

Individual Growth and Development Plan. The teachers' responses to the questions regarding completion of their Individual Growth and Development Plans are presented in Table 28. One hundred twenty-eight teachers (94%) indicated that they had made some progress on the completion of their Individual Growth and Development Plans. Thirty-seven teachers (27%) had completed *all* parts of their Plan. Eight teachers (6%) reported that they had made no progress on their plan.

Table 28. Teachers' progress on their Individual Growth and Development Plans

<i>As of today, how much of the Plan have you completed?</i>		
Response	Frequency	%
All	37	27.2
More than half	31	22.8
Less than half	60	44.1
None	8	5.9
Total	136	100.0

Points of Contact

The teachers responded to four questions regarding points of contact, two of which concerned points of contact with peer reviewers and two of which related to points of contact with the summative evaluator. Table 29 presents the percent of teachers responding *yes* to each of the questions. Sixty percent of the teachers indicated that they had decided on points of contact with their peer reviewer and 39% indicated that points of contact with their peer reviewer had taken place. The percent responding *yes* to the two questions concerning points of contact with the summative evaluator were lower. Thirty-six percent of teachers reported that they had decided on points of contact with their summative evaluator, and 24% indicated that points of contact with the summative evaluator had taken place.

Table 29. Teachers' progress on points of contact

Points of Contact Component	Total Yes/Total	% Responding Yes
Have you and a peer reviewer decided on any of your points of contact?	81/136	59.6
Have any points of contact between you and your peer reviewer taken place?	52/135*	38.5
Have you and your summative evaluator decided on any of your points of contact?	49/136	36.0
Have any points of contact between you and your summative evaluator taken place?	32/131*	24.4

* The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the N/A option.

Student Learning Goals

Completion of the Student Learning Goals component involves five activities. A teacher must: a) select or develop a quality assessment; b) establish a mastery score for the assessment; c) establish student starting points; d) set student learning goal(s); and e) share student learning goal(s) with the summative evaluator. Teachers participating in the Student Learning Goal component of the Model were asked to check all the activities that they had completed. Completion rates for the five activities ranged from 33% to 56%, with about one-quarter of the teachers (28%) indicating that they had not completed any of the activities. The highest completion rate (56%) was associated with setting student learning goal(s). See Table 30 for complete results.

Table 30. Teachers' progress on Student Learning Goals.

<i>As of today, how far along are you in the Student Learning Goals process? (Check all that have been completed.)</i>		
Activity	Frequency/Total	% Checking the Activity*
I have selected or developed a quality assessment.	72/162	44.4
I have established a mastery score for the assessment.	59/162	36.4
I have established student starting points.	67/162	41.4
I have set student learning goal(s).	91/162	56.2
I have shared student learning goal(s) with the summative evaluator.	53/162	32.7
None of these have been completed.	45/162	27.8

* Percentages sum to more than 100% because respondents were asked to check all activities that had been completed.

How Much Time Was Spent

The teachers were asked to provide their best estimates of how much time they had spent working on activities required by the Teacher Practice, Student Learning Goals, and Student Engagement components of the Model. The results are shown in Table 31. Note that the median is reported rather than the mean because response options (i.e., *1 hour or less*, *More than 20 hours*) did not allow for the computation of a mean. The medians indicate that, on average, teachers had spent approximately 3 hours preparing their Individual Growth and Development Plans, 2 hours working on their Student Learning Goals, and 1 hour working on the assessment of student engagement.

Table 31. Amount of time spent by teachers on the implementation of Model components

Evaluation Component	Total No. of Respondents	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mode
Preparing the Individual Growth and Development Plan	137	1 hour or less	20 hours or more	3 hours	1 hour or less (28%)
Working on Student Learning Goals	150	0 hour	More than 20 hours	2 hours	0 hour (17%)
Working on the assessment of student engagement	173	0 hour	More than 20 hours	1 hour	Less than 1 hour (24%)

Implementation of the Teacher Practice and Student Learning Goals Components

Teachers were asked about the resources and consultants that were utilized in carrying out activities related to the Teacher Practice and Student Learning Goals components of the Model and the perceived benefits associated with those resources and consultants. They were also asked about the difficulty level of carrying out the processes related to these two components of the Model.

Teachers participating in the Teacher Practice component of the Model were asked to report what references they utilized, the individuals with whom they consulted, the perceived benefits of the references and consultants, and the perceived benefits of the Model on their instructional practice. Their responses are in the narratives and tables that follow. More thorough information regarding teachers' responses to the process of carrying out the Model components can be found in Appendix H.

Individual Growth and Development Plan

Teachers' responses regarding their use of district, school, and PLC goals to inform their Individual Growth and Development Plans are shown in Table 32. Of the 137 respondents, 75% reported that they referred to their district goals, 81% reported that they referred to their school goals, and 77% reported that they referred to their PLC goals while developing their plan. Seven percent of the total respondents did not refer to any of these goals.

Table 32. Goals referred to by teachers while developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan

Did you refer to your . . . ?	Total Yes/ No. of Respondents	% Responding Yes
District goals	103/137	75.2
School goals	112/137	81.8
PLC goals	106/137	77.4

To assist teachers with the development of their Plans, teachers were provided the *Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook* (Handbook) as well as training MDE. Teachers were asked to rate how helpful these two resources were in guiding them through the development of their Plans. Teachers were also asked how working on their Plans influenced their instructional practice. Seventy-nine percent of the total respondents reported they referred to the Handbook while working on their Plan. Of those who did refer to the Handbook, 107 teachers (77%) indicated that the Handbook provided adequate guidance. Of the 117 respondents who attended MDE training, 55% stated that the MDE training provided adequate guidance. Overall, 79% of respondents reported the process of formulating their Plan had helped them to reflect on their instructional practice. See Table 33 for complete results.

Table 33. Teachers' ratings on the usefulness of the Handbook and training in developing their Plans and the perceived benefits of the process of developing their Plans

Evaluation Component	Total Somewhat true or Completely true/No. of Respondents	% Somewhat true or Completely true
<i>The Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook</i> provided adequate guidance for developing my Plan.	82/107 ^a	76.6
The MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing my Plan.	64/117 ^a	54.7
Formulating my professional growth goals helped me to reflect on my instructional practice.	101/131 ^b	79.4

^a The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the "Did not use the Handbook" option.

^b The response options were *Completely untrue*, *Somewhat untrue*, *Neither untrue nor true*, *Somewhat true*, *Completely true*, and *N/A*. The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the *N/A* option.

While developing their Plans, some teachers consulted with various individuals. Seventy-five teachers (63% of 120 respondents) indicated that they consulted with a peer reviewer, 32 teachers (29%) consulted with their summative evaluator, an equal number of teachers, 32 (29%), consulted with someone other than a peer reviewer or summative evaluator, and 43 (55%) teachers consulted with no one and wrote the Plan on their own. See Table 34 for results.

Table 34. Teachers' consultants while developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan

Evaluation Component	Total Yes/ No. of Respondents	% Responding Yes
I consulted with a peer reviewer.	75/120	62.5
I consulted with a summative evaluator.	32/112	28.6
I consulted with no one; I wrote them on my own.	43/78	55.1
I consulted with other.	32/89	36.0

Of the 32 teachers who consulted others, their write-in responses indicated that 38% consulted with a fellow teacher or colleague and 34% consulted with their PLC. See Table 35 for complete results.

Table 35. Other write-in responses for teachers' consultants while developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan

Response	Frequency	%
Fellow teacher(s)/colleague(s)	12	37.5
PLC	11	34.4
Write-ins with a frequency ≤ 3	5	15.6
No write-in	4	12.5
Total	32	100.0

A summary of responses indicating the teachers' views on how beneficial their consultations were can be found in Table 36. Regardless of whom they consulted with, the majority of teachers found the consultations to be beneficial. More specifically, 87% found it beneficial to consult with a peer reviewer, 59% found it beneficial to consult with a summative evaluator, and 67% found it beneficial to consult with other individuals.

Table 36. Teachers' perception of whether or not it was beneficial to consult with someone when developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan

Evaluation Component	Total Yes/ No. of Respondents	% Responding Yes
It was beneficial to consult with a peer reviewer.	76/87	87.4
It was beneficial to consult with a summative evaluator.	35/59	59.3
It was beneficial to consult with <i>other</i> .	31/46	67.4

Note: The response options were *Yes*, *No*, and *N/A*. The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the *N/A* option.

The responses of teachers with regard to the level of difficulty experienced in developing their Plans are summarized in Table 37. Of the 127 teachers who had written their professional growth goal(s) and the 124 who had written their performance standard(s), almost half (46% and 48%, respectively) thought these tasks were either *difficult* or *very difficult*.

Table 37. Teachers' views on the difficulty level in developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan

Evaluation Component	Total Somewhat difficult or Very difficult/ No. of Respondents	% Somewhat difficult or Very difficult
Writing professional growth goal(s)	58/127 ^a	45.7
Writing the performance standard(s) for my goals	59/124 ^b	47.6

^a The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the "Have not written my professional growth goals" option.

^b The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the "Have not written the performance standard(s)" option.

Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric

Teachers responded to two questions related to the performance standards for the teacher practice rubric. These questions were asked to find out teachers' views on the effectiveness of the performance standards as a tool for identifying areas of their practice for professional growth and evaluation. Sixty-eight percent of the teachers reported that the performance standards were effective in helping them to identify areas of their practice for professional growth, and 64% reported that the performance standards were effective for helping them identify areas of their practice for evaluation. Table 38 presents the percent of teachers who responded *somewhat true* or *completely true* to the questions.

Table 38. Teachers' views on the effectiveness of the performance standards for the teacher practice rubric

The Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric were an effective tool for . . .	Total Somewhat true or Completely true/No. of Respondents	% Somewhat true or Completely true
Identifying areas of my practice for professional growth.	90/132	68.2
Identifying areas of my practice for evaluation.	84/131	64.1

Note: The response options were *Completely untrue*, *Somewhat untrue*, *Neither untrue nor true*, *Somewhat true*, *Completely true*, and *N/A*. The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the *N/A* option.

Student Learning Goals

Teachers participating in the Student Learning Goals component of the Model were asked about the resources they consulted while developing their Student Learning Goals and the level of difficulty experienced while working on the various requirements of this evaluation component. Table 39 presents the teachers' responses regarding the individuals they consulted while developing their Student Learning Goals. Sixty percent of the respondents said that they consulted with a peer reviewer and 28% said they consulted with a summative evaluator. Other consultants, such as fellow teachers and PLC's, were utilized by 31% of the respondents.

Table 39. Individuals whom teachers consulted with while developing their Student Learning Goals

Evaluation Component	Response	Frequency	%
In formulating my student learning goals, I consulted with: (check all that apply)	A peer reviewer	79	60.3
	A summative evaluator	36	27.5
	No one; I wrote them on my own	25	19.1
	Other write-in consultants	40	30.5
	- Fellow teacher(s)/colleagues	10	7.6
	- PLC	7	5.3
	- Intervention team	5	3.8
	- Other ^a	18	13.7
Total respondents		131	*

* Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option as their response

^a Responses include other write-ins that occurred only once

Teachers' responses regarding whether or not the consultants were perceived to be beneficial are presented in Table 40. Ninety percent of respondents found that it was beneficial to consult with a peer reviewer, and 64% reported that it was beneficial to consult with a summative evaluator. Eighty percent of those who consulted with someone other than a peer reviewer or summative evaluator indicated that the other consultations were beneficial.

Table 40. Teachers' perception of whether or not it was beneficial to consult with someone when developing their Student Learning Goals

It was beneficial to consult with . . .	Total Yes/No. of Respondents	% Responding Yes
A peer reviewer.	84/93	90.3
A summative evaluator.	41/64	64.1
Other	32/40	80.0

Note: The response options were *Yes*, *No*, and *N/A*. The total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the *N/A* option.

To assist in the development of their Student Learning Goals, teachers were provided a Student Learning Goals Handbook and training from MDE. Teachers were asked to rate how helpful they thought those two resources were in guiding them through the development of their Student Learning Goals. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers referred to the Handbook, with 62% of them indicating that the Handbook provided adequate guidance in helping them to develop their Student Learning Goals. Eighty-four percent of the teachers attended the MDE training session, and approximately two-thirds of the teachers (68%)

reported that the training helped them develop their Student Learning Goals. See Table 41 for complete results.

Table 41. Teachers' ratings of the usefulness of the Student Learning Goals Handbook and MDE training in developing their Student Learning Goals

“... provided adequate guidance for developing my student learning goals.”	Total Somewhat true or Completely true/No. of Respondents	% Somewhat true or Completely true
Student Learning Goals Handbook	64/104 ^a	61.5
MDE training	77/114 ^b	67.5

^aThe total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the “*Did not use the handbook*” option.

^bThe total n for percentage calculations does not include participants who selected the “*Did not attend the MDE training*” option.

The responses of teachers regarding completion of the Student Learning Goal components are shown in Table 42. The completion rates associated with the five components ranged from 33% for sharing the student learning goal(s) with the summative evaluator to 56% for setting student learning goals. It should be noted that 28% of the respondents indicated that, at the time they participated in the survey, they had completed none of the five components. Thus, it appears that the majority of teachers still have to complete at least four of the five components before their Student Learning Goals can be approved.

Table 42. Teachers' completion rates associated with the components of the Student Learning Goals (N=162)

Student Learning Goals Component	% of Teachers Who Have Completed the Component
Selecting or developing assessments to measure the goals	43.8
Establishing mastery scores for the assessment	35.8
Establishing student starting points	40.7
Setting student learning goals	56.2
Sharing student learning goal(s) with the summative evaluator	32.7

The responses of teachers regarding the level of difficulty experienced while working on the components of their Student Learning Goals are shown in Table 43. The percentages of teachers selecting *somewhat easy* or *very easy* were very similar across the four components, ranging from 38% for establishing mastery scores to 45% for establishing student starting points. Interestingly, these percentages are also very similar to the percentages associated with *somewhat difficult* or *very difficult* (31% to 40%). Therefore, teachers seem to be equally divided regarding whether the tasks associated with Student Learning Goals are easy or difficult for them to carry out.

Table 43. Teachers’ perceptions of the difficulty of completing the components of their Student Learning Goals

Student Learning Goals Component	Total n of Respondents	% Somewhat easy or Very easy	% Somewhat difficult or Very difficult
Selecting or developing assessments to measure the goals	116	43.1	37.9
Establishing mastery scores for the assessment	109	37.6	40.4
Establishing student starting points	119	45.4	31.1
Setting student learning goals	123	39.0	39.0

Note: The total n for percentage calculations for the four components does not include participants who selected the “*Have not selected or developed assessment*” option, the “*Have not developed mastery scores*” option, “*Have not developed my student starting points*” option, or the “*Have not developed student learning goals*” option.

Student Engagement

Teachers participating in the Student Engagement component of the Model were asked to identify the methods they were planning to use to assess student engagement. The survey presented a list of six methods (MDE Student Engagement Survey, observation, student portfolios, student presentations/performances/projects, teacher portfolio, and video) plus an *other* write-in option, and teachers were asked to check all that applied. A total of 177 teachers responded to the survey item. Twenty-nine percent (52) of the respondents indicated that they had not yet decided on the methods they would use. Of those who did identify methods of assessing student engagement (125), the most commonly selected were observation (86%), student presentations/performances/projects (56%), the MDE Student Engagement Survey (38%), and student portfolios (16%). There was little commonality among the write-in *other* methods provided by 18% of the teachers. Some examples of other methods identified by the teachers were attendance, participation, student reflections, and tests. Table 44 presents a summary of the teachers' responses.

Table 44. Methods that teachers reported they will use to assess student engagement (N=125)

Evaluation Component	Response	Frequency	%
What methods will you use to assess student engagement? (Check all that apply.)	Observation	107	85.6
	Student presentations/performances/projects	70	56.0
	MDE Student Engagement Survey	47	37.6
	Student portfolios	20	16.0
	Video	13	10.4
	Teacher portfolio	7	5.6
	Other write-in methods	22	17.6
Total respondents selecting methods		125	*

*Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option as their response

Overall Satisfaction

The questionnaire asked teachers to indicate their level of overall satisfaction with the Model by responding to the question, *Based on your experiences to date, how satisfied are you, overall, with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model?* The majority of the teachers (57%) indicated that they were *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied* with the Model. The teachers who did express a specific sentiment, however, were more inclined to be dissatisfied (30%) than satisfied (13%). In addition, it should be pointed out that no teachers indicated that they were very satisfied with the Model. See Table 45 for results.

Table 45. Teachers' overall satisfaction with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model

Response	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	25	9.9
Dissatisfied	51	20.2
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	143	56.5
Satisfied	34	13.4
Very satisfied	0	0.0
Total	253	100.0

A second question was posed to the teachers to gauge their overall impressions of the Model. The question was, *Based on your experiences to date, how would you rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance?* Nineteen percent of the respondents indicated that, at this point in time, they had no opinion to offer. Those who did express their opinions, however, were much more likely to select a relatively low rating rather than a high rating. More specifically, although 21% gave a rating of *good*, 20% gave a rating of *poor* and less than 1% gave a rating of *excellent*. See Table 46 for results.

Table 46. Teachers' rating of the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance

Response	Frequency	%
Poor	49	19.5
Fair	93	37.1
Good	53	21.1
Very Good	8	3.2
Excellent	1	0.4
No Opinion	47	18.7
Total	251	100.0

Summary of Teacher Online Survey Results

Progress to Date

Individual Growth and Development Plans. Ninety-four percent of teachers indicated that they had made some progress on the completion of their Plans. Twenty-seven percent had completed *all* parts of their Plan, 23% reported they had completed *more than half* of their Plan, and 44% had completed *less than half* of their Plan.

Points of Contact. Sixty percent of teachers indicated that they and their peer reviewer had decided on points of contact, and 39% of teachers indicated that points of contact with the peer reviewer had taken place. Over one-third (36%) of teachers reported that they and their summative evaluator had decided on points of contact with 32 of those teachers (24%) indicating that points of contact with the summative evaluator had taken place.

Student Learning Goals. Twenty-eight percent of teachers indicated that they had not completed any of the tasks associated with the Student Learning Goals component. The highest completion rate (56%) was associated with setting Student Learning Goals. Therefore, the teachers have many tasks to carry out before their work on Student Learning Goals is complete.

How Much Time Was Spent

Time spent on Individual Growth and Development Plans, Student Learning Goals, and Student Engagement. The time teachers spent preparing their Individual Growth and Development Plans, Student Learning Goals, and assessments for Student Engagement varied a great deal with the vast majority of teachers spending an hour or less in each of these three areas, while other teachers spent more than 20 hours. This large range may be explained by recalling that more than a quarter of the teachers (28%) reported that they had not yet completed *any* of the three tasks.

Implementation and Sources of Support

District, Building, and PLC Goals. Most of the teachers participating in the Teacher Practice component of the Model indicated that they referred to their district's goals (75%), school's goals (82%), or PLC goals (77%) when developing their Individual Growth and Development Plan.

MDE Materials and Training Sessions Regarding the Individual Growth and Development Plan. More than three-fourths of teachers (77%) referenced the *Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook* and reported that it provided adequate guidance while working on their Individual Growth and Development Plan. In addition, 79% of the teachers who referred to the Handbook reported that it had helped them reflect on their instruction practice. Eighty-six percent of the teachers reported that they had attended MDE training sessions, and 55% of those respondents stated that the MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing their Plan.

Individuals Consulted While Developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan. Consulting with Other Individuals. Sixty-three percent of teachers indicated they had consulted with a peer reviewer while preparing their Plan, 29% stated that they had consulted with their summative evaluator, and 36% indicated they consulted with other individuals (e.g., fellow teachers, PLC). However, over half (55%) stated that they did not consult with anyone, but instead wrote the Plan on their own. The majority of teachers who did consult with someone regarding their Plan reported that they found the consultation to

be beneficial. The peer reviewer consultation appeared to be especially effective since 87% of teachers who consulted with a peer reviewer reported that the consultation was beneficial.

MDE Materials and Training Sessions Regarding the Student Learning Goals. Teachers participating in the Student Learning Goals Component were asked whether they referred to the Handbook to develop their goals. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers said they referred to the Handbook, with 62% of them indicating that the Handbook provided adequate guidance in helping them to develop their Student Learning Goals. In addition, 84% reported they had attended MDE training sessions, with 68% reporting that the training was helpful with respect to the development of the Goals.

Individuals Consulted While Developing the Student Learning Goals. Sixty percent of teachers indicated that they consulted with a peer reviewer when developing their Student Learning Goals, 29% reported that they consulted with a summative evaluator, and 31% stated that they consulted with other individuals. Only 19% of the teachers indicated that they consulted with no one and wrote their Goals on their own. This percentage is considerably lower than the 55% who stated that they wrote their Individual Growth and Development Plans on their own without consulting anyone. Similar to the findings regarding the consultation benefits for development of the Plans, the majority of teachers reported that it was beneficial to consult with someone regarding development of their Student Learning Goals. Furthermore, the peer reviewer consultation was viewed as being particularly effective, with 90% of teachers stating that it was beneficial to consult with a peer reviewer regarding their Student learning Goals.

Teacher Performance Standards Rubric. About two-thirds of teachers (68%) reported the performance standards rubric was useful for identifying areas for professional growth. A similar percentage of teachers (64%) responded that it was an effective tool to identify areas of instructional practice that could be evaluated.

Overall Satisfaction

Based on their experiences to date, the majority of the teachers (57%) indicated that they were *neither dissatisfied nor satisfied* with the Model overall. The teachers who did express a specific sentiment, however, were more inclined to be dissatisfied (30%) than satisfied (13%). Moreover, no teachers responded that they were *very satisfied* with the Model.

The teachers were asked to rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of teacher performance. Nineteen percent of the respondents indicated that, at this point in time, they had no opinion to offer. Those who did express an opinion, however, were much more likely to select a relatively low rating rather than a high rating. More specifically, although 21% gave a rating of *good*, 20% gave a rating of *poor* and less than 1% gave a rating of *excellent*.

Teacher Beliefs Survey

Method

Response Rate

The teacher beliefs survey was administered as a paper/pencil questionnaire. The instrument was distributed to 13 of the 15 districts that are piloting the student engagement component of the MDE teacher evaluation Model. New Ulm and St. James Public Schools did not participate in the survey. The questionnaires were hand delivered to the districts by MDE staff (n = 5) or by CAREI staff (n = 2) or were sent by mail (n = 6). Completed questionnaires were placed in envelopes, sealed, and returned by MDE (n = 5) or CAREI staff (n = 1) or were sent by mail (n = 7). The overall response rate was 86% (897 out of 1,047). The response rate for individual districts ranged from 76% to 100%. Details regarding questionnaire distribution and response rate are presented in Appendix F.

Participants

The 897 participants in the teacher belief survey include 856 individuals who indicated they held a teaching position and 38 additional individuals who indicated they held a non-teaching staff position (e.g., nurse). Among the 856 teachers, 71% are females. The number of years these 856 teachers had been in their current districts ranged from 0 years to 55 years, with a mean of 11.5 years. The total number of years teaching ranged from 0 years to 55 years, with a mean of 15.0 years. Table 47 summarizes the grade levels that teachers reported they were teaching during the 2013-14 academic year. The highest frequencies tended to be associated with a single teaching level (e.g., elementary school, 35%). However, it was fairly common for teachers to hold positions that involved teaching at two or more levels (e.g., middle school and high school, 15%). With respect to the subjects taught, most of the elementary and middle/high school teachers indicated that they taught a regular curriculum or core course subjects (31% and 27%, respectively). Other assignments included middle/high school electives (e.g., agriculture, world languages), specialist subjects (e.g., music, physical education), and special education (15%).

Table 47. Teaching level of teacher beliefs survey respondents

Teaching Level*	Frequency	%
PreK	29	3.2
PreK ES	2	0.2
PreK ES MS HS	1	0.1
ES	316	35.2
ES MS	40	4.5
ES HS	4	0.4
ES MS HS	21	2.3
ES MS HS Other	3	0.3
ES MS Other	2	0.2
ES Other	5	0.6
MS	112	12.5
MS HS	135	15.1
MS HS Other	3	0.3
HS	176	19.6
HS Other	8	0.9
Non-teaching staff	38	4.2
Other/Blank	2	0.2
Total	897	99.8

* PreK = Preschool, ES = Elementary School = K through grade 5, MS = Middle School = grade 6 through grade 8, HS = High School = grade 9 through grade 12. “Other” includes responses that did not fit into any categories

Survey Instrument

The questionnaire contained 12 questions designed to elicit teachers’ beliefs regarding the use of student surveys to evaluate teacher performance. The seven-point response scale was strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, neither disagree nor agree, somewhat agree, agree, strongly agree. Two sample items are: *I am in favor of using feedback from student surveys to evaluate my teaching* and *I am concerned that students will give low ratings in a subject that is difficult for them*. The questionnaire also included background information items regarding the grade level(s) that would be taught in the 2013-14 school year, subject area, gender, number of years teaching in the district, and total number of years teaching. The survey instrument can be found in Appendix C.

Results

The results of the teacher beliefs survey are not included in this report because a post-survey will be administered in spring 2014. The report that will be distributed after the post-survey data are analyzed will summarize responses given on the pre-survey, post-survey, and the pre-post change.

Summative Evaluator Interviews

Method

Fourteen summative evaluators were interviewed across eight districts (see Table 48) in late November-mid December 2013. Of the eight districts, six are implementing the whole Model, one district is implementing the Student Learning Goals component and the Student Engagement component, and one district is implementing the teacher practice component of the Model. The interviews were based on a semi-structured interview protocol CAREI had developed in consultation with MDE staff (see Appendix J). All of the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. As a first step in the data analysis, we read each transcript and sorted the summative evaluators' remarks into categories that represent major areas of the interview protocol: training, Individual Growth and Development Plan, points of contact, peer review process, Student Learning Goals, flexibility of the Model, professional learning communities, technology, effect on teachers and students, and sustainability. Next, we reviewed the data within each category and further sorted responses into three sub-categories: what they have done in that area of the Model, what worked, and what challenges they encountered. Finally, we reviewed the data within each sub-category to identify themes in the summative evaluators' responses.

Table 48. Summative evaluator interviews by district/school

District/School	No. of Summative Evaluator Interviews
Caledonia	1
Granada Huntley East Chain	2
Lester Prairie	2
New Ulm	2
North Shore Community School	2
Perpich Arts High School	1
Pine Island	2
Pine River-Backus	2
Total	14

Results

Training

When asked what worked well about the training, five of the summative evaluators interviewed mentioned Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) staff by name as being fantastic resources. Tyler, Greg, and Deb were all mentioned as providing quality training and support for the staff. As stated by one of the evaluators:

Tyler and Greg were phenomenal. They did a nice job of presenting the material [and] answering questions. When staff asked certain things they were very professional and willing to work with them, emailed certain teachers, and connected them with other districts who were doing the same type of goals.

Another person had this to say about the MDE trainers:

Very down to earth, very genuine...always willing to help, never seem like they are irritated with your question if you call them out of the blue and say what does this mean?...They're always willing to take the time to explain things, so we have been very happy with them.

In addition to having positive things to say about the trainers, one summative evaluator described the trainings as *“timely and well-organized.”*

Interviewees were also asked about the challenges they have encountered related to training. Challenges that were reported included the travel time to the district trainings, although these respondents also recognized that webinars would be a challenging alternative in rural districts with unreliable cellular service. While one person argued that the trainings were repetitive, another described them as too minimal, stating that more time was needed.

There were three summative evaluators who spoke of the challenge of getting teachers on board with the training. According to one, teachers are creatures of habit, and getting them to open up to the possibility of change is a challenge. Another principal described it like this:

When you are dealing with teachers who have been through one cycle of new initiatives after another that go away, they get a little standoffish.

Several recommendations were given for future training for the Pilot. One summative evaluator suggested the training days be shortened and cover fewer topics. In another district, the recommendation was to make more of the training available online rather than at a site. According to this evaluator, it would allow staff to complete the training at more convenient times without taking them away from the school. Finally, there was a recommendation for increased training on the technology components used in the pilot.

Individual Growth and Development Plans

Twelve summative evaluators were interviewed about the Individual Growth and Development Plans. Eight of them said their teachers had completed and turned in their plans. Four of the eight summative evaluators also said they had reviewed the plans and two of the four said all the plans had been approved by both a peer reviewer and summative evaluator. Of the other four summative evaluators, one said s/he was setting deadlines for the teachers to turn in their Individual Growth and Development Plans, another said the Individual Growth and Development Plans had been coming in but s/he hadn't seen all of them yet, and one said the Individual Growth and Development Plans were due in mid-December for review.

Four summative evaluators said it was helpful to set a deadline for teachers to turn in their completed Individual Growth and Development Plans. Previous experience with similar processes also seemed helpful. Three summative evaluators indicated that the process of developing an Individual Growth and Development Plan was easy for their teachers because the teachers had done something previously that was similar, such as SMART goals, professional growth plans, or using a version of the Danielson rubric. Another summative evaluator talked about the challenge for his teachers in writing goals because *“the district has had absolutely zero evaluative guidance in the last several years.”*

One summative evaluator said that the Individual Growth and Development Plan form was a *“great help because they gave us a good guide to follow”* and another mentioned, *“the performance standards were useful to use.”*

One summative evaluator talked about how the process of developing an Individual Growth and Development Plan helps teachers reflect on and intensifies the process of looking at their skills:

I think it forces the staff to not only self-reflect, but a lot of them started to look at data. And it forced them to look at skills and I think that part has been great. We would do it to some degree [already] but the level of intensity was heightened with this process.

The summative evaluators spoke about a variety of challenges related to the Individual Growth and Development Plan. Three of them said time was an issue, specifically the time needed for the summative evaluator to review and approve the Individual Growth and Development Plans. Two of the four summative evaluators who had already reviewed their teachers' completed Individual Growth and Development Plans remarked that in some cases they had to return the Individual Growth and Development Plans to the teachers because they weren't specific enough. As a result, they would need to review those Individual Growth and Development Plans again once the teachers had refined them. As one summative evaluator said,

The amount of time that I had to put into these growth plans is horrendous...out of [the] ten I have reviewed so far, one met a standard that I accepted and the other nine I made notes and sent [them] back to them for corrections...which means I'll get them back again. It's going to take 100 hours to do all these.

Although some summative evaluators saw an advantage in their teachers having done a similar goal setting process previously, the similarity could also be a disadvantage because some teachers questioned why they needed both an Individual Growth and Development Plan and a SMART goal.

Three summative evaluators noted that initially there was some confusion about the Individual Growth and Development Plan form. For example, it was unclear why the goal wasn't listed first on the form and what "goal number" meant. In two cases, teachers were uncertain about how many goals they needed to have for their Individual Growth and Development Plan. Several summative evaluators suggested that it would be helpful to have samples of completed Individual Growth and Development Plans available for teachers to examine as they develop their own plans.

Points of Contact

Interviews with the summative evaluators indicate that half of them had begun to implement points of contact. Based on these experiences, the summative evaluators identified some benefits to the points of contact process and also some challenges and questions.

Twelve summative evaluators were interviewed about points of contact. Five of them had not carried out any points of contact yet and a sixth said s/he was unlikely to be very involved in this part of the Model because the other summative evaluator in the district would have that role with most of the teachers. Of the six summative evaluators who had begun to implement points of contact, five had completed the formal observation cycle at least once with all of their new teachers. They had also carried out some other types of points of contact activities with tenured teachers such as planning conferences, reviewing curriculum, conducting walk-throughs, and reviewing student learning data. The sixth summative evaluator had conducted professional observation/conference points of contact by attending PLC meetings.

The summative evaluators made positive comments about the points of contact they had done so far. One noted that s/he has had good discussions with the teachers through the points of contact. Another remarked on the value of doing observations related to teachers' personal goals and helping teachers reflect on their goals:

Doing district personal goals and then doing the observations related to those specific things has been very helpful so I can go to a teacher and say, “Well, this is your goal. Here’s how it went. I thought you did a good job of that. Here’s how you could have maybe done it better, in my opinion or how do you think it went?” Just trying to ask a lot of questions to them so they can kind of bounce it back to me.

One summative evaluator described the value of having a more formal process for talking with teachers:

Sitting down with teachers more often than you normally do, to sit and talk with them and they understand what you’re expecting; that’s been good. It’s kind of forced the issue in a way. You did some of it, but not to this point of following a certain thing exactly.

Three of the summative evaluators set up a schedule for the points of contact with their teachers at the beginning of the year and they said this had been helpful.

One summative evaluator didn’t think it would be an issue to complete all of the points of contact required by the Model because s/he had already been doing something similar. In contrast, five of the summative evaluators expressed concern about how feasible it would be to carry out all of the Model’s points of contact on top of their other responsibilities. As one summative evaluator pointed out:

I’m averaging twelve meetings a week for observation purposes and they are each about half an hour...I feel there are things that are really good that I did when I was a principal before that I’m not able to do because of this. So it represents twelve meetings a week, but it doesn’t represent the time required to even prepare for those meetings.

One summative evaluator noted that “points of contact by an administrator on a non-summative evaluation year is only in the Pilot. It doesn’t explicitly say that in the legislation...so the Pilot is a little more intensive in that measure.” Another summative evaluator noted that it is difficult to schedule time to meet with teachers because teachers are “working hard on their prep time” and many have coaching or other responsibilities after school. One summative evaluator commented on the challenge of scheduling time with teachers when teachers “have various hours throughout the day when they are free.”

Another summative evaluator raised questions about how the points of contact activities that are not in the formal observation cycle are supposed to be done. The evaluator noted that the conversations during these points of contact have been helpful, but because s/he hadn’t asked teachers to send information such as a unit plan before the point of contact occurs, the summative evaluator was “giving feedback on the fly and I haven’t had time to really think about it very much.” In some cases, the summative evaluator found that “what they bring in for their point of contact does not always align with their plan.”

Two summative evaluators talked about challenges related to documenting the points of contact and one said,

What I have to figure out now is what level of documentation has to occur in that point of contact. Is that something that I have to document for each point of contact or is that their [teachers’] responsibility? And they somehow document that and write that up and maybe I sign off on it.

Another summative evaluator commented that probationary teachers are probably going to be overwhelmed by the points of contact. S/he elaborates: “They’ll get three summatives, three peer reviews, and then three more from summative evaluators that are not summatives.”

Peer Review Process

The summative evaluators are in the early stages of establishing peer review systems in their schools. Twelve summative evaluators were interviewed about this topic and five said their teachers have already been linked to their peer reviewers. Two other summative evaluators were planning to begin the process of matching teachers to peer reviewers in early December. Among the five remaining summative evaluators that were interviewed, three indicated that they had not addressed this part of the Model yet and two others said they were just starting to work on this aspect of the Model.

The summative evaluators used or were planning to use a range of methods to link teachers with peer reviewers. In four cases, the implementation team asked for volunteers and then matched the volunteers to teachers based on criteria established by the implementation team. In one district, a summative evaluator described the process as follows:

For each peer reviewer, the team tried to “get one elementary, one secondary, and then somebody from a different area or discipline [than the peer reviewer]...or if you had two males, get a female, mix it up a little. We also looked at the personalities and tried to make sure we mixed up some good personalities, but didn’t find any of them that just really clashed so much that they weren’t going to work together.

In another district, one of the summative evaluators explained, “We worked on getting a match based on the person’s goals in the Individual Growth and Development Plan, their experience level, their own feelings about comfort with the peer reviewer, and the peer reviewer’s personality.” In yet another case, teachers selected the teacher who would review them.

The other three summative evaluators indicated that in their schools, each teacher selects her/his peer reviewer. One of them offered more detail about the process:

Every teacher is required to do one peer review and every teacher is required to be peer reviewed. If you wanted teacher X and they’re already doing somebody else, you’re going to have to select a different person.

In one district, the peer reviewers have already begun to carry out their points of contact with teachers. One challenge they have encountered is scheduling the peer reviews because, as one of the summative evaluators explained, the teachers who volunteered to be peer reviewers said they wanted flexibility in the timing of the points of contact. As the summative evaluator explained:

They did not want to have it where most of their time in the day [for points of contact] was taken away from their class time. They’ll just do it right before school time, prep time, or after school. They were not going to change their times drastically.

The summative evaluators offered to bring in substitute teachers to free up the peer reviewers to do points of contact or documentation during the school day, but none of the peer reviewers had requested this option.

Student Learning Goals

Of the 12 summative evaluators interviewed on this topic, two reported they had no plans to deal with the Student Learning Goal component of the Model until the second half of the year. Interviewers asked what they had done so far, what was working, and what challenges they were encountering. They also asked for any recommendations that the summative evaluators might have relating to the Student Learning Goals component.

In all but one instance where schools or districts had begun this process, they had completed it. One summative evaluator reported that the teachers had written their Student Learning Goals, but they had not yet been reviewed or approved. In almost all cases, the school either chose a school-wide goal or a grade-level goal. There was only one summative evaluator who mentioned that teachers were developing their Student Learning Goals independently.

When asked what was working well, the responses were school and district specific. The only idea that was expressed by a couple of summative evaluators was to align the Student Learning Goals with other goals already in place in the school or district. One evaluator mentioned aligning them with the teacher's growth goals and another one reported that having the same overall goal for all participants (such as using a particular literacy assessment) made establishing and approving Student Learning Goals more manageable. One respondent mentioned the increase in teacher conversations that were happening on a daily basis:

What I have been enjoying about it is we've been having very good conversations around things like assessment, standards, and Student Learning Goals.

Looking more closely at student data and making more data-driven decisions was seen as a positive aspect of the Student Learning Goals process. The other thing that was mentioned was that having Tyler and MDE as a resource was incredibly helpful.

In addition to what was going well, interviewers asked summative evaluators to share their challenges in this process. School culture and teacher buy-in was a challenge for some, as described by one summative evaluator:

The battle we are fighting in this building is that...so much of what has been done has been done because someone told you had to do it. There was no buy in...I've got to do this so I'll just write something down. There is not a belief that this can help us improve achievement.

One summative evaluator commented that the biggest challenge was convincing teachers why they should do this:

My gut feeling is that most of the teachers are doing what they have to do as part of the process, not to actually see the growth.

Aside from school culture or getting teacher buy-in, other challenges were reported. There seemed to be some confusion on the part of teachers regarding completing the Student Learning Goal form itself as it was mentioned in two instances. There was also confusion about the difference between Student Learning Goals and professional growth goals. In two districts, several teachers saw them as the same. Evaluators from two districts mentioned the challenge for specialists, who are less likely to have a classroom goal due to the small number of students they work with. Therefore, creating a Student Learning Goal that could be used for all of their students was more challenging for specialists.

One summative evaluator tried to present the process in a positive light to staff by describing it in the following way when teachers talked about the amount of time and effort required:

This is what good teaching is, so don't look at it as an extra thing I have to do, setting student learning goals; it should be more embedded in what we already do, there is already a lot of things that we have in place. We've always done a professional growth plan that involves a student data piece. This is just more formalized, and it's called Student Learning Goals.

The only recommendation for improvement mentioned by those interviewed was a request for MDE to provide a rubric to follow in determining what makes a Student Learning Goal acceptable or unacceptable. According to one evaluator, there was nothing provided to measure the rigor of the Student Learning Goals.

Flexibility of the Model

During their interviews, eight summative evaluators had an opportunity to comment on whether the resources and activities in the teacher practice component of the Model are sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of all teaching assignments (specialists/generalists) and all stages of a teaching career (new/probationary, mid-career, late-career). All eight of the summative evaluators indicated that the resources and activities in the teacher practice component were meeting the needs of all types of teachers, whether the teacher was part-time or full-time, specialist or generalist, new or late career. As one of the two summative evaluators explained,

I think with the growth plan [Individual Growth and Development Plan] made sense to everyone across the board, whether they were new, or a specialist, or a special educator. They could all find something they were interested in improving on, documenting, and keeping track throughout the year.

Another respondent shared,

If it's a specialist teacher, I'm very comfortable with that. Yes, I've done some observations and I think this is very applicable and we can make the teacher practice rubric fit.

In contrast, one of the eight summative evaluators experienced challenges conducting points of contact with non-classroom teachers, such as counselors: “When I’m observing a counselor work with an individual child and then I’m sitting with a rubric about teaching classroom instruction it becomes very frustrating.” To address the situation, the summative evaluator had “copied Danielson rubrics for other types of teachers from another district,” but s/he was unable to put those rubrics into the online system the district is using for points of contact.

Another summative evaluator indicated that s/he was unlikely to do formal observations with the school’s nurse, yet s/he could envision using other types of points of contact. S/he explained,

We had a great conversation about how we can talk about planning from a nurse’s perspective or the environment you create. What kinds of instruction [she] do[es]; she occasionally goes into a classroom to do a hand washing lesson. But a lot more of it is more individual health plans. I have this student with diabetes, I meet with him daily and I’m really trying to teach him how to track his blood sugar and write it down. That’s a good instructional piece.

Although the teacher practice component seemed to work well for all types of classroom teachers, three of the summative evaluators experienced challenges with applying the Student Learning Goals component of the Model to certain cases. For example, one summative evaluator explained how s/he tried to apply them to specialists:

The Student Learning Goals got tricky for specialists and the assessments that they needed to create for themselves and prove. Special Educators have really struggled because they didn't have a class goal necessarily. Maybe we can do two targeted need goals...because they have such a small group of students...At first it was kind of difficult for them to wrap their head around. At first they were saying, "This doesn't pertain to us." No, it does, we're going to get creative and think about how you can accomplish this in your setting, smaller groups.

Another summative evaluator remarked, "With special education, the class goal can be hard because a class might be just two students. The implications might be that if one person doesn't meet a goal, then 50% of your class has failed to achieve mastery."

In describing how the Model works for specialists, one summative evaluator explained,

Before doing this Model, most of the specialists used informal, local assessments to document progress. They had to change their frameworks to work with the Model and keep refining their plans to make [it] work for them.

Another summative evaluator described how her/his district was drawing on job descriptions to create assessments for a counselor and an athletic director: "What we've done for them is to create specific lists of items that they need to have completed, kind of part of their job description; we just pulled those off there."

Professional Learning Communities

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) were mentioned in half of the summative evaluator interviews and each of the respondents said the teachers were working in their PLCs to develop their Individual Growth and Development Plans and/or Student Learning Goals. One summative evaluator remarked that in her/his school, the process of setting Student Learning Goals is "virtually the same" as the PLC process they use.

Technology

Eight of the fourteen summative evaluators were using an online system for managing their points of contact. Three summative evaluators described aspects of the systems that they found especially helpful. One of these summative evaluators explained how the online system facilitated her/his observation process:

To have everything online has been very beneficial, I've loved that. You really don't ever have to have paper...Typically, I would have a pre-conference and they would come ready to answer some questions, but I couldn't read the answers to the questions before I got there because I didn't demand that they put them in. But now they almost have to input them and then they come in and we talk about them; same with the post-conference. In my mind, that's made that all much, much easier. The pre- and the post- flows a little easier for me because of the [online] system.

Another respondent shared that the online system helps them easily identify what stage each teacher is at:

I can just look at the list of a person's name and see what color they're at and which ones they've completed and how many they haven't completed. Sometimes it's a pain to put things on there, but the most helpful piece is I don't have to sift through emails to find out who have given me their Individual Growth and Development Plan. I can just look along here and see who's got it and if they don't I can let them know.

Although overall the summative evaluators were positive about the benefits of an online evaluation system, they did mention some challenges as well. Four summative evaluators wished that their system had more functionality. Specifically, some of the summative evaluators would like to be able to view the points of contact documentation submitted by peer reviewers, one would like to be able to sort the evidence based on the corresponding indicator number, and another would like to be able to load additional rubrics onto the system to use with staff such as counselors.

Effect on Teachers and Students

The final interview question for summative evaluators was whether or not they had observed an impact on teachers or students since the Pilot began. Three of the fourteen summative evaluators interviewed did not provide any response to the question and another three reported they had not seen any impact on teachers or students. Of those who provided feedback on the impact, they spoke strictly of the impact on teachers. Overall, there were more positive impacts reported than negative impacts. However, evaluators in three separate districts stated that teachers were experiencing increased stress due to the time demands of the Model. One summative evaluator also mentioned increased teacher stress and anxiety related to the peer review process and performance evaluations.

On the other hand, evaluators in three districts reported that since the Pilot was implemented, there had been more communication – and, specifically, more sharing of ideas – between teachers. One person said that another impact was that teachers and administrators were more visible in classrooms and that had a positive impact on teaching and learning. According to two summative evaluators, a positive impact of the Model had been an increase in focus on professional goals for teachers. Finally, a couple of people mentioned that teachers who may not have considered working together were working together and learning from one another. As one summative evaluator stated,

Some teachers would say, I don't like this pilot, but I think deep down they realize that they're working on something and getting better at something, especially getting different points of view from other teachers.

Sustainability

When asked about the sustainability of the program in the future, all of the summative evaluators expressed concerns, with the exception of one who said s/he hadn't done much work with the Model. Three evaluators from small districts and/or charter school noted that they have a significantly smaller staff than larger districts and would not have been able to participate without a great amount of staff support from the state. Two summative evaluators reported that they were doing what needed to be done for the pilot year, but knew it would have to be scaled back significantly in future years to make it manageable. More than half of respondents stated that it was too time-intensive to be sustainable. For example,

It's overwhelming...it is an 86 page document. I don't know how many staff members have read it, I haven't read it cover to cover...the time part is the part that really scares me.

Of those interviewed, two evaluators reported that they would have to hire additional staff or create a team to administer and oversee the Model if they were to continue it next year. The time required was a great concern in districts where the summative evaluator was also the superintendent and principal with limited resources in terms of administrative staff. When asked how much time s/he spent per week on the pilot, one summative evaluator reported,

I spend 20 minutes probably per teacher's goal sheet going through it and double-checking the data, times 40. So 800 minutes (over 13 hours) just for the goals. As for the PLC time, and meeting with Tyler, I'd say an additional 8-10 hours in that. [21-23 hours per week]

One summative evaluator talked about what it would look like next year:

As an administrator I say, "You know what? I am going to follow state statute and we're going to pursue this." And quite honestly, it could be good for students, but we've done so many other things that were good for students that went away because of new legislation...it's no different than MCA testing and GRAD testing now. GRAD testing has gone away and it was the only student accountability testing that we had and now it went away... We will do it because it's a state requirement, but it will be significantly watered down from what the pilot is.

Teacher Interviews

Method

Forty teachers across eight districts (see Table 49) were interviewed at the end of November into early December 2013. A range of experience was represented (see Table 50), from first-year teachers to veteran teachers with 37 years' experience. The teachers have an average of 9.3 years teaching in their current district and an average of 13.3 years teaching overall. Twenty-six of the teachers were tenured in their district and fourteen were on probationary status. We had an even distribution of elementary and secondary teachers in the group (17 elementary, 17 secondary, and 10 middle school, with some overlap) and a cross-section of class teachers and specialists.

Table 49. Teacher interviews by district

District/School	No. of Teacher Interviews
Caledonia	5
Granada Huntley East Chain	4
Lester Prairie	4
New Ulm	6
North Shore Community School	4
Perpich Arts High School	4
Pine Island	5
Pine River-Backus	8
Total	40

Table 50. Characteristics of teacher interview participants

	No. of Teachers ¹
Grade Level Band	
--Elementary	17
--Middle	10
--Secondary	17
Subject Area	
--English	4
--English language learners	1
--Generalist	9
--Mathematics	4
--Science	3
--Social studies	5
--Special education	6
--Specialty subject (art, music, physical education, family and consumers science)	9
--Title I dedicated	2
Job status	
--Full-time	29
--Part-time	1
--Unknown	10

¹ For some variables, the number of teachers is greater than 40 because some teachers teach in more than one grade level band or subject area.

District superintendents and/or principals were asked to select four teachers from their district to participate in the interviews based on the following criteria: two of the four teachers should teach in the elementary grades and two of the four teachers should teach in the secondary grades. In addition, at least one of the four teachers must be on probation, at least two of them must be tenured teachers who will receive a summative rating as part of the Pilot, and at least one of the must be a teacher who spends all of his/her teaching time in a subject other than math or reading/English language arts.

The interviews were based on a semi-structured interview protocol we developed in consultation with MDE staff (see Appendix K). All the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. As a first step in the data analysis, we read each transcript and sorted the teachers' remarks into categories that represent major areas of the interview protocol: training, Individual Growth and Development Plan, points of contact, peer review process, Student Learning Goals, professional learning communities, technology, and sustainability. Next, we reviewed the data within each category and further sorted the teachers' responses into three sub-categories: what they have done in that area of the Model, what worked, and what challenges did they encounter. Finally, we reviewed the data within each sub-category to identify themes in the responses.

Training

Trainings with Tyler and Greg were very much appreciated by teachers across all settings. While people were especially enthusiastic about their work in face-to-face training, MDE staff also received high marks for making the most of conference call and webinar models. In particular, Tyler and Greg were seen as knowledgeable and very willing and able to listen to and answer questions. In general, teachers indicated that they were impressed with Tyler and Greg's ability to convey the big picture while also getting to the practical concerns of teachers. Their efforts to connect various components to each other and their encouragement to explore how the components of the Pilot align with or contribute to work that teachers are already doing were also much appreciated. Their training, for the most part, was seen as practical, clear, and relevant. Overall, 23 of the teachers indicated that they found MDE trainings useful, with 12 mentioning Tyler and/or Greg by name.

There was very mixed feedback about how teachers would like the training to be delivered. Some teachers complained that having two half-day trainings felt "*disjointed*," while others found it helpful to have the information divided up into more manageable "*chunks*." A few teachers thought it was helpful to have the training in August so that it was fresh and relevant as they geared up for the school year, while others said it was too late to be useful, and still others thought it was better to get the training once school had started so that it could be applied immediately.

Many teachers thought that the Pilot built upon the work of PLC's or other practices already in place, while just as many felt that the Pilot was just another thing competing with other initiatives for time and energy. Many teachers loathed the webinar format, primarily due to technical issues, but several said that it was helpful, particularly when supplemented by a face-to-face training. One teacher explained that it was helpful that the district divided teachers up into small groups, each of which had a conference phone call, so that all could hear and ask questions.

Teachers who received full day trainings had some useful insights. Seven teachers indicated that it was simply too much seat time and that the sheer volume of information was overwhelming. One teacher explained,

I realize from a necessity of travel that all-day sessions are probably the norm – it's just too much... We came back from lunch exhausted from the four hours of listening.

Another frustration was being presented with an overwhelming amount of information without opportunities for application. One teacher suggested it would have “*helped to have an activity, more hands on to really understand it, practice with each other, [and] do the actual paperwork right away.*” The lack of in-training application contributed to several teachers' concerns about retention. One teacher said,

It's pretty typical of any training...it gets you thinking, the day of the training while you're doing it, you feel like you're on target, you know what you're doing, and then you walk away from it and forget.

Another consistent comment across districts concerned the sheer volume of information and a need for streamlining. One participant explained, “*I would rather do a few things well than everything all at once.*” Another respondent suggested,

I'd like to pare it down, make it less gobbledygook and more direct...give me the cliff notes version, tell me what I need to do and I will do it. Quite often you walk away going, what are we supposed to do?

Teachers saw the aims and strategies of the Pilot as relevant to the work they were already doing, but applying all these new details to that existing work was overwhelming. One teacher shared,

It's a lot. Even though it's stuff we're doing all the time – looking at test data, we're adjusting our instruction – it's a lot to then put it all in this neat package and have it make sense.

While some teachers had a sense of clarity and excitement about the Model and many more were struggling through it but saw the potential, there remained a great deal of anxiety and confusion amongst teachers. There was a sense of general anxiety that they just weren't sure they were doing it right, which was further complicated by confusion about terminology, forms, online applications, and other unrelated district initiatives, and some teachers just weren't really sure how it all fit together. Many teachers expressed the desire for some user-friendly tools, models, or examples of what's already been done to provide a concrete sense of how it all comes together. Teachers felt they needed more training about what they should be doing as peer coaches and how exactly this role intersected with teacher evaluation. One teacher explained,

I think there's some fear of them giving good candid feedback to who they're working with because they're afraid that that might get used later in a summative evaluation against the teacher.

The data so far has discussed, primarily, teacher experience with MDE training, but it is very important to recognize that each of the districts in the Pilot had very different experiences with training. In some districts, MDE provided two in-service trainings, one in late August and one in September. In other districts, teachers received training in the Pilot from district and school administrators who had previously received training by MDE. There was also training conducted by iObservation and BloomBoard, with varying degrees of integration with the MDE Pilot. In addition to this training explicitly tied to the Pilot, teachers took part in various other kinds of training sometimes explicitly aligned with the Model (i.e., Q-Comp, PLP's, and grants), sometimes implicitly aligned, and sometimes completely unrelated. Sometimes these intersections were generative and other times exceedingly confusing for teachers.

Individual Growth and Development Plans

Thirty-two of the 40 teachers interviewed were working in schools that are piloting the Teacher Practice component of the Model. Twenty-three of the 32 teachers indicated that they had completed an Individual Growth and Development Plan at the time of their interview. Four other teachers said they were in the process of finishing an Individual Growth and Development Plan. Five of the interviews did not contain sufficient information to determine if the teacher had completed an Individual Growth and Development Plan.

When the teachers were asked to describe the process of developing their Individual Growth and Development Plans, they gave 40 examples of things that were working well in the process and 25 examples of things that were challenging or not working well.

The most common themes that emerged from the teachers' descriptions about what was working well with the Individual Growth and Development Plan process were the clarity of the Individual Growth and Development Plan form and the ease of completing it, the potential of the Individual Growth and Development Plan process to help teachers stay focused on developing an area of their practice, and the value of the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric for completing the Individual Growth and Development Plan. There were nine examples that described a positive aspect of Individual Growth and Development Plan form. The teachers noted, for example, that it was “*pretty straight forward*,” “*user-friendly*,” and “*all the terminology made sense*.” There were also nine examples that depicted the potential of the Individual Growth and Development Plan process to help teachers stay focused on developing an area of their practice. For example, one teacher remarked,

I think every year you have ideas...but through this process, you're committed to doing it. [Typically,] you have good intentions at the beginning of the year, but then you get overwhelmed...and you don't quite get to those goals.

Another respondent shared that it was a good reminder:

I refer back to [my Individual Growth and Development Plan] and I'm trying to work on those things. I think it's good to have that constant reminder of what you're working on because we do so easily get side tracked and so it's nice to have a focus. Not that you still don't get side tracked, but it kind of keeps bringing you back.

Finally, there were eight examples in the interviews where teachers discussed the value of the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric for completing the Individual Growth and Development Plan. Teachers appreciated that the Rubric describes what a proficient teacher would look like “*actually written out in words*” and were pleased that the Rubric was very specific because that helped them be clear on what they needed to improve. They also remarked on how broad the Rubric was with the four domains included.

The 25 examples of things that were challenging or not working well with Individual Growth and Development Plan process were more varied. The largest category concerned the Individual Growth and Development Plan form or suggestions for making the form easier to complete. There were six examples related to teachers being unclear about aspects of the form, such as: “*What needed to be put in what boxes? Do you put that number here or do you actually write out the goal that you're reaching for?*” Another teacher said, “*The goal number and the performance standard confused a few people until we realized that it pertained to the rubric.*” Additionally, one respondent asked: “*What's the difference between the goal and the strategies or activities to reach the goal?*”

Three teachers described how they were confused about whether the individual teacher goal on the Individual Growth and Development Plan was different from the Student Learning Goals or whether they were the same or related in some way. Finally, there were three instances where teachers said finding time to develop their Individual Growth and Development Plan was challenging.

Points of Contact

When asked about the points of contact component of the Pilot, the majority of the teachers said they had not yet completed a point of contact. Of the 41 teachers who were interviewed, only nine teachers indicated that they had completed a point of contact. Three teachers said they had completed a point of contact with a summative evaluator.

Teachers who had completed at least one point of contact were asked to describe their experiences. Five teachers described the point of contact as informal or casual. For example, one teacher said, *“It was really brief; we didn’t really meet at all. I just sent him some things and he looked over it and wrote back to me.”*

A teacher from another district echoed this perspective by saying, *“If you don’t finalize it, it’s fine. You can always go back and re-do it again, so that was not a big deal.”* One teacher explained how his/her district is using Google Documents to track points of contact. Another teacher said that his/her district is using the MDE forms and then recording the points of contact on their own. Seven teachers reported filling out the points of contact form from MDE, although this may be an underrepresentation as not all teachers were explicitly asked whether they had filled out the form. Individual comments suggest that teachers are using points of contact to talk about goals and work on their Professional Growth and Development Plans.

Three teachers said that points of contact provided them with helpful feedback. Two teachers described the points of contact as very successful. Individual comments reflected the idea that the points of contact process is an improvement from how schools conducted observations in previous years. For example, one teacher said that the points of contact have improved standardization across teacher observations. An additional comment highlighted another area of improvement: *“It was more comprehensive, it doesn’t seem like just another hoop you have to jump through.”*

Individual comments also suggested that there is a general understanding of the points of contact process and teachers are beginning to use the terminology in their everyday conversations. One teacher who had completed a point of contact expressed that s/he was positive about completing future points of contact: *“I’m looking forward to some of the other points of contact, the observations so you can get out and see what’s going on.”*

When asked about the challenges they experienced with points of contact, teachers raised several concerns. Five teachers said the tracking system is unclear. For example, one teacher said: *“You would think you would have to have a little bit of evidence to show that you’ve done it rather than a signature because then it’s just jumping through hoops.”*

Another teacher echoed concerns related to documentation:

Let’s say my colleague...is using the domain where they’re incorporating technology. If I’m on her thing as a point of contact and I go in there and I show her something on the Smart Board, with the magic pen tool, does that qualify as a point of contact?...Do I have

to spend five minutes in there? Do we need to document something to have that be an official point of contact?

In addition, two teachers noted that the feedback and comments they have received from their peers and/or summative evaluator through the points of contact process have lacked personalization. One teacher went on to say that the feedback s/he received lacked utility for improving his/her instructional practices. Three teachers said that it will be a challenge to find time to complete all of the required points of contact. Relatedly, one teacher said reviewing all the point of contact forms might be an unreasonable time commitment for administrators. Individual comments expressed uncertainty related to expectations for the formality of the observation, number of points of contact, and amount of detail on points of contact forms. More specifically, one teacher said there was some confusion at his/her school around what was meant by “*teacher defined*” on the points of contact forms. Also, one teacher indicated that he/she did not like the fact that his/her summative evaluator was filling out a point of contact online as the teacher was being observed.

When asked about recommendations to improve the points of contact component of the Pilot, teachers provided several ideas. Two teachers said they would have liked a “*big picture*” explanation of the points of contact first before breaking down the information into smaller parts. One teacher suggested creating an electronic portfolio to record points of contact using Google Documents. Other suggestions included in-person meetings, peer evaluators from the same grade level, drop-in observations from a summative evaluator, and providing examples of the wording for points of contact documentation. Also, one teacher recommended reducing the number of required points of contact:

One of the things that came out again was if five points of contact is a lot, maybe we could narrow that down to three very meaningful points of contact. That was a big concern of some of my colleagues... Otherwise, I don't think it's asking us anything that we can't do. I think it's fairly approachable.

Peer Review Process

According to the interviews with teachers, most districts have not started actively working on the peer review process. Out of forty teachers interviewed, twenty-eight had not met with their peer reviewer at the time of the interviews in late November and early December. Many of these teachers did not comment on the peer review process because they had such limited experience with it. Thirteen out of 40 indicated that they had a peer reviewer identified. Matching between the teacher and peer reviewer was determined either by the summative evaluator or an implementation team (in six cases) or the teachers selecting their own peer reviewers (in seven cases). Twelve of the matched teachers had initiated conversations either as a peer reviewer or as a teacher being reviewed. Only three teachers indicated that they had completed a point of contact with one of their peer reviewers.

Since very little had happened in the peer review process in most districts, the response about peer review from teachers was brief and speculative. Six teachers talked about the positive potential for peer review; five of these were specifically looking forward to receiving feedback, although they hadn't received any yet. One teacher who had received feedback found it helpful, and two additional teachers believed that the feedback would help them improve their teaching practice. Six teachers brought up the benefit of learning from other teachers, and there seemed to be a sense that the peer review process would lead to greater collaboration and collegiality: “*I think that's one of the good things about this pilot...that we're getting to know and talk with other teachers.*” Two teachers noted that having trusting relationships with colleagues made the prospect of feedback less intimidating. Another teacher mentioned appreciating that the feedback was shared prior to being posted on BloomBoard.

The idea of peer review as more fair or comprehensive than traditional principal evaluations came up, with one teacher saying,

If you're going to evaluate teachers, this is how you should be doing it. Not just on one principal walking through your classroom on one day. [Peer review] documents your professionalism.

There was some confusion about how peer review will work, with three teachers out of the forty teachers interviewed (both reviewers and reviewed) expressing concern about the sufficiency of the evidence or documentation. One peer reviewer said, in anticipation of a point of contact: “*I don’t even know what I’m doing; I’ll just probably look at her [peer review partner’s] data.*” However, the bulk of the concern about peer review was with the amount of time the classroom visits and documentation will take. Eight teachers talked about the demands on their time or concerns about time demands on their peer reviewers. Three teachers wished that BloomBoard could be accessed from home to make documenting the feedback from the peer review process more flexible. Five teachers worried about getting substitutes for peer reviewers during this pilot year and especially in subsequent years.

Student Learning Goals

Of the 36 teachers in the seven districts that are implementing Student Learning Goals, there were varying levels of completion. Twelve teachers had completed their Student Learning Goals, nine had begun to develop them, four said they had barely started, and ten teachers indicated that they had not started the process at all. In many cases, the Student Learning Goals are linked to a building-wide goal. Fifteen teachers said they were using a building goal or adapting one for their students, whereas four teachers talked about a district-wide goal informing their Student Learning Goals. In addition, six teachers specified that they had written their own Student Learning Goals that were not connected to a building or district goal. Six teachers said they had settled on a department goal. In creating their Student Learning Goals, nineteen teachers cited specific data that helped them make their decision about the class goal and the targeted-need goal.

One teacher describes his/her use of data in developing Student Learning Goals:

It gave me permission to spend the time with a lot of data...Look at your students. Look at the data. See where they excel. There were some really nice surprises and some areas of concern that were much more evident by taking that time. The Student Learning Goals allowed me to focus, not just for my target group, but all of my classes to ask: “Where are they really, where do they need to be and, what can I do?”

Another teacher described his/her process of using data:

By the time you looked at all the assessments to really figure out your target group, it was a quality two hours if not more. And it was something I went back and forth to. I didn’t just take it and do it. I looked at one piece of data and made a list, looked at another piece of data and made a list, high to low, figured that out with the next piece of data to see how they correlated. It was time consuming. Was it worth it? You bet!

There were certainly some positive feelings about the development of Student Learning Goals among the teachers who were interviewed. The biggest benefit, noted by ten teachers, was connected to student learning. The Student Learning Goals made teachers more aware of “*where students are,*” especially new

students who entered their classes. Five teachers found that the Student Learning Goals provided a helpful road map for their planning, and five teachers were happy with the increased focus and collaboration around student learning.

Regarding the development of the Student Learning Goals, seven teachers described the process of creating the goals as clear and understandable, and two teachers found the experience more understandable than the Individual Growth and Development Plan. Helpful tools for these teachers were the *Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook*, which three teachers mentioned, and the training and examples, which six teachers mentioned. Six teachers thought that it was easy to “plug” assessments and mastery scores that were already in place into their new Student Learning Goals. According to one of the respondents, being able to set the terms of assessment by developing their own Student Learning Goals afforded a certain amount of control over the evaluation process..

While teachers in four out of the seven Student Learning Goals districts seemed very clear about what the Student Learning Goals were and how to develop them, teachers in three districts expressed frustration and confusion about this part of the Pilot. Aspects of the Student Learning Goals forms that caused the most difficulty were the class goal versus the targeted need goal, which was cited by nine respondents. Two teachers mixed up the Individual Growth and Development Plan and the Student Learning Goals. Another teacher discussed the confusion about having to create another set of goals after having just completed the first set:

One of the things that was confusing to people is writing more goals. I just finished my Individual Growth and Development Plan and now you're telling me I've got to do more goals?

Six specialist teachers found the Student Learning Goals to be less workable and expressed concerns over irregular schedules (e.g., “*I only see my kids twice a week*”) enormous numbers of students (e.g., in physical education or orchestra classes), or complex configurations of students that might make it difficult to establish a class goal.

Another area of difficulty was the establishment of starting points and benchmarks, cited by eight respondents. Four teachers struggled with the expectation built into the Student Learning Goals that a certain portion of a class would not achieve mastery; they found it hard to acknowledge during the planning process that a targeted need group would likely not reach the same level as the rest of the class. The tracking of progress toward Student Learning Goals also came up as a concern for three teachers, along with stress about letting it all fall apart, which was voiced by two teachers.

Professional Learning Communities

For the purposes of the MDE Evaluation, questions related to professional learning communities (PLCs) were not explicitly included in the interview protocol. However, in their responses to other questions, 16 of the 41 teachers described their experiences with PLCs in relation to the Pilot.

Of the 16 teachers who made comments about PLCs, six of them said that they discuss Student Learning Goals during PLC time. Relatedly, five teachers said their PLC discusses and/or works on Individual Growth and Development Plans as a group. Four teachers said they use PLC time to discuss curriculum. Three teachers described their PLCs as a source of support to do what's needed, such as receiving reminders and answers to questions. According to two teachers, PLCs are used to give and receive

feedback. One teacher reported that the data person from his/her district has attended their PLCs to provide direct support.

Several teachers described PLCs positively. Four teachers described their PLCs as helpful and two teachers said their PLCs have improved teacher collaboration and communication. For example, one teacher said,

In my 20 years, this last two to three years here, between what we're doing now with this teacher pilot and the instituting PLCs, has had a huge impact on collaboration and teacher communication between us.

One teacher added that leaders from their PLCs address questions with administration and relay the information back to the group. While there were seven comments recognizing the benefits of PLCs, four individual comments identified distinct challenges: not enough time, lack of follow-up, lack of data-driven discussion, and difficulties related to relaying information from MDE to PLCs. One teacher described the challenges with his/her PLC:

I'm listening, but my stuff will sometime sit in the exact same place for a week and then on Wednesday morning I grab it and go again. So, there's no time, no follow up, every thing's fragmented.

Overall, the 16 teachers who made comments related to PLCs described ways in which their PLC time is used to complete tasks related to the Pilot. For some teachers, PLC time is used to discuss and/or work on Student Learning Goals and Individual Growth and Development Plans. PLCs are also serving as a place for teachers to receive support, give and receive feedback, and get questions answered. Teachers also highlighted the challenges of PLCs, such as time limitations and a lack of opportunity for follow-up.

Technology Platforms

In the course of our interviews, a number of teachers brought up their experiences with online observation tracking systems.

For the most part, feedback at this early stage of implementation was tentatively positive. Several users indicated their usefulness as a tool for developing the Individual Growth and Development Plan, which is significant because throughout the interviews teachers indicated the importance of models and tools that help facilitate this kind of work. One respondent also talked about using an online system for setting Student Learning Goals, saying, “*Once you've set your student learning goals, it asks you to set your goals to help your students get there.*”

Most users expressed positive experiences with sharing information in order to facilitate points of contact. One teacher said,

As soon as they hit submit you're seeing it and as soon as you hit submit they can see it. And then the whole tracking of information is all right there, rather than having to have a folder with papers and more papers and they don't get into the right folder...it's just very clean in this regard.

One teacher appreciated that the system required more detailed and better communication between a teacher and summative evaluator than traditional observation models in which the teacher may have

simply provided a lesson plan and received feedback in the form of a rubric or checklist. Another appreciated that the rubrics they were using were integrated in the system.

Overall there were a few minor complaints, but users seemed optimistic about the possibilities for the software. One interviewee said,

If the State goes forward with this, I would recommend [online system] and or something similar...It provides teachers with working examples that they can reference as they're making their own professional development plan and even how to assess those things.

One user was enthusiastic about a scheduling and highlighting tool that the online system offered:

You can schedule all of your observations...you can write all of your observations and then in there you highlight...one part of my lesson and say, well that really aligned to this indicator...and so by the end of it...a whole bunch of them are highlighted that you demonstrated...and that's really helpful.

Another participant appreciated the email reminders and timeline feature:

I think the scheduling part of it was nice because it automatically sends out the reminders and emails to people that you're scheduling with and there's a little timeline in there that will keep track of all that documentation sort of a paper file that everybody can access.

Effect on Teachers and Students

At the time of these interviews, most respondents (31 out of 40 teachers) had no comment when asked if they had observed any impact on teachers and students from the school's participation in the Pilot.

Three teachers noted an effect of teachers “*coming together*” toward a goal of student learning, and four teachers felt that having goals linked to student learning would probably have a positive impact on student learning. Two specialist teachers felt validated by being included in the work, since they had professional goals and Student Learning Goals but are not always viewed as having them. Finally, while one teacher thought that the Pilot was “not terrible,” two teachers find it to be a source of worry and anxiety.

Sustainability

Of the 40 teachers who were interviewed, 28 teachers had comments about the sustainability of the Model. The responses to the question, “What do you think about the sustainability of the Model overall? Do you have any general reactions to the legislation?” basically fell into three main categories:

- Initial reaction to the Model and the utility of its components (17 comments)
- Positive ideas to make the Model more effective (8 comments)
- Mixed (negative and positive) overall reaction to the Model and the legislation (19 comments)

Most of the 28 teachers who had something to say about the sustainability question had a range of comments that fell into more than one of the three categories noted above. In other words, there were very few respondents who had only positive or only negative responses.

Initial Reaction to the Model

Most of the comments that teachers had regarding their initial encounter with the Model were about the forms and design. The reactions were nearly evenly split about the usefulness of the long-term use of forms versus finding the process overwhelming. Some examples of positive opinions include: *“I thought the forms were pretty generic and pretty workable.”*; *“They’re an effective resource.”*; *“Those cheat sheets have been very helpful with understanding it because it is a new process.”*; and *“I’m glad that it’s an opportunity for everyone to be held accountable for student learning.”* Some examples of teachers’ positive reactions to the Model include the following:

Once you start getting into the forms and you start filling everything out [for] your actual individual plan and student learning goals...then the terminology and all the background information seems to make a lot more sense.

It has to be manageable somehow for everyone to do well, so, it’ll be just interesting to see how that all funnels out and to be workable. I think the process is fantastic. I think it’s a good thing for teachers to be doing.

The other dominant range of responses from the initial reaction to the Teacher Evaluation Process and Model is that teachers see it as an effective form of professional development. For example, teachers shared the following:

It’s the process of thinking about teaching in a professional way that’s important and hopefully it’s an ongoing process, rather than “we’re doing this this year because it’s the Model.” Maybe we can come out of this with our own Model that will maybe feel more natural to us.

I think there’s just a general benefit to spending time with colleagues that we don’t get a lot of time to do, thinking about practice and our pedagogy.

It’s going to make us better and it’s going to be great for the kids because we are going to perform better. We’re placing ourselves on a higher and higher pedestal. We have a respect for ourselves, and our colleagues because we’re doing the right thing. I envision that it’s going to greatly enhance our teaching and that the kids are going to benefit from it a great amount. This should have been done years ago.

I like that it’s teacher-driven in a way, as opposed to what’s just being handed down “from above.”

I do think it’s a good idea and when I see some of the balking at it, some of that makes me think it’s a really good idea because it’s people not wanting to examine their own practice. They’re just wanting to do what they do and get through it...But, I want to have my kids’ teachers be good teachers, and want to be good teachers, and so the part that’s been cumbersome for me are actually attitudes.

Positive Ideas to Make it Work. Eight teachers had specific suggestions to make the Model more effective:

We are going to have one sub come in [for] just the morning every Monday, Wednesday, Friday for two weeks and they would just rotate around different classrooms that needed it. So you can

get all your points of contact done and meetings and pre- and post- meetings and everything done during the school year.

When more schools, other schools, hopefully are doing this Pilot, then I can connect with [other specialist teachers], too, so I can say: "Are you using [this teaching and assessment tool?] or are you using something else?" Because we're going to have to somehow get a group together to make it even more beneficial to us as specialists, when you don't have somebody else in the building that's in your area.

Having a timetable might be something that each individual school or something that you have to work out between the summative evaluator and the individual teacher...And maybe not something hard and fast...but more of a guideline, examples that show if you have this done by this time and this done by this time.

I think schools need to consider their schedules and how they are doing day-to-day business. We can't plug this into the old school model. You know, where we're going to do it before school and after school. It just isn't going to work. It needs to be...a period of the day that's designated for teacher planning time, for professional growth...once a week...periodically...Teachers...just don't ever get a chance to have that reflective time, and people need that.

We're really trying to find language that will work for us for our master agreement [for the union]. So, doing the pilot will help us see what will work and what won't work as we develop our district plan.

I really think [we should] have other summative evaluators besides principals who can maybe be in the district. Some sort of funding for summative evaluators probably would help...because I don't know that dumping everything on the principals is going to...be feasible...One of the elements out here in these smaller schools is that you've got one principal in a building or you're sharing a principal between buildings. I think I can see some real issues with trying to do this.

The most common negative comments were reflected in the following:

"It's hard to keep track of what it is what...It just seems like a lot of paper work and with so much paper work, I feel like we could get a lot more done if we didn't have to fill in so many forms."

It feels like I'm assessing all the time, just so I will have proof and data for [filling out] these [papers]...I feel like I'm not teaching, I'm just assessing. You know?

Mixed Overall Reaction. The largest number of comments, 19, was about sustainability from teachers and was a mixture of both negative and positive reactions to the Model and the legislation. Most respondents combined their good feelings about the Model with hesitation about the legislation and the ultimate purpose(s) for having this new aspect of the law on the books. There was also some misunderstanding about the connection between the Pilot and school funding:

It [the teacher evaluation system] just needs to be something that is teacher-friendly. I'm very unclear on really what this is going to help do. I'm not really sure what the whole intent is. To always keep in mind what is the main purpose of doing this? Is it to improve student achievement? Is it to evaluate teachers? Is it to improve teacher performance?

I do like that it's a consistent approach to evaluating teachers. I don't like the part that it could be connected to other funding.

Every time you go to be a teacher in a new place you have to figure out how that person is going to do your evaluations. This could provide a consistent system that all teachers would know from district to district, so it could be good that way. [But] I don't like how the legislators are trying to tie it to funding in particular...I think there's lots more issues with that.

Right now...we are trying to sell it as professional growth here at the district. Some people are seeing it as this big, big thing coming down from the state that's going to be teacher evaluation only. I think they have to be more set [clear] about that concept of it being professional development, because I think there's a lot more buy in with it being proposed as professional development versus "we're going to use it as an assessment tool."

It's great to have goals and to have opportunities for professional development and those things, but it [must] become an internal thing and whether or not you want to use it...to improve your craft.

Six respondents also commented on the need for continued financial resources to support the teacher evaluation system after the pilot year is over:

How to maintain without the funding?...Getting the help the first year for us, I think, has been crucial. I don't know how schools are going to do it, without the resources, especially small schools like us.

I think in the future for peer review, it's going to be a significant increase in budgets for schools to try to figure out how to pull people out...of their class times to monitor other people and I think that's the challenge really.

In an ideal world...we would have a library of resources in sets of books and suggestions to study...or a help line.

I believe we're a district that's been struggling with staff development and resources for materials...I worry that we won't have the resources once we don't have the pilot.

The notion of sustainability for the teacher evaluation system and the Model, if districts choose to use it, is well summarized by the following comment:

I guess my whole thing with doing these Models and reform in education is, "Is it going to bring about change?" I mean, "Are you going to have that personal level of buy in that you have to have?"...That's the hardest thing...to get teachers to buy into it and not feel like it's another hoop to jump through.

Summary

Minnesota Statutes 122A.40, Subdivision 8 and 122A.41, Subdivision 5 requires that districts begin evaluating teachers in the 2014-2015 school year. In response to the statute, during early winter 2011, the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) convened a work group in early winter 2011 to consult with the MDE Commissioner to develop a state model for teacher growth and development. In winter 2013, MDE released the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model and began planning for a pilot of the Model during the 2013-2014 school year. The Model consists of three components for evaluating teachers: 1) teacher practice, 2) student engagement, and 3) student learning and achievement.

Training and Technical Support. On the whole, the summative evaluators were very impressed with the quality of the MDE trainings. They expressed a high level of satisfaction with the presentations, although they acknowledged that the amount of information tended to overwhelm or exhaust their teachers. Teachers echoed this in their interviews, expressing the wish that they could have topics broken into shorter sessions.

However, of the teachers who reported they attended the MDE training, 55% stated that the training provided adequate guidance for developing their Individual Growth and Development Plan. A greater percentage of teachers, 77%, referenced the Handbook and reported that it provided adequate guidance while working on their Individual Growth and Development Plan.

Implementation of the Pilot. Teachers expressed approval about the way the Model and a statewide teacher evaluation system in general serves as a stimulus for districts to provide professional development. However, teachers also expressed serious concern about the sustainability of the Model when there are limited funds for professional development and release time for peer reviewers. Teachers noted the heavy burden of evaluation time on principals as summative evaluators.

Comments that came out in interviews with summative evaluators acknowledged that their own enthusiasm in implementing the Model had a strong positive effect on the perceptions of faculty and staff about the Model.

Individual Growth and Development Plan. Almost all teachers who were surveyed and interviewed reported that they had made some progress toward completing their Individual Growth and Development Plans, although more than half described their Plans as partially complete. About two-thirds of teachers surveyed found the performance standards rubric useful for identifying areas for professional growth, and an equal number of teachers responded that it was an effective tool to identify areas of instructional practice that could be evaluated. Teachers who were interviewed found the Individual Growth and Development Plan form to be clear, and for many, it was familiar, having written similar growth plans in the past. Most teachers consulted at least one colleague in developing their Individual Growth and Development Plan and found this collaboration to be helpful.

Points of Contact. Half of the summative evaluators who were surveyed and interviewed indicated that they had planned their points of contact, which was consistent with the responses from teachers about points of contact with summative evaluators. Fewer than half of the summative evaluators had completed any points of contact at the time of the survey and interviews. Both summative evaluators and teachers expressed concern about time in scheduling points of contact going forward.

At the time of the interviews, well over half of the teachers surveyed had decided on points of contact with their peer reviewers and over one-third of teachers said they had completed one point of contact with

a peer reviewer. Again, both summative evaluators and teachers had concerns about time as peer reviewers schedule points of contact. During interviews, teachers and summative evaluators alike expressed hopes for increased collaboration in the peer reviewer relationship.

Student Learning Goals. Summative evaluators whose buildings had selected school-wide Student Learning Goals found that the uniformity of the goal made developing and approving these goals manageable. In settings where there was a building-wide goal, summative evaluators had high completion rates with their teachers and expressed satisfaction about the process. Roughly half of the teachers surveyed and interviewed had either completed or made some progress on developing their Student Learning Goals. Well over half of teachers surveyed indicated that they had benefitted from consulting a peer reviewer in developing their Student Learning Goals. Interviewed teachers talked positively about how they used student data to set starting points and decide upon benchmarks.

However, many summative evaluators found that their specialist teachers and non-teaching faculty struggled much more to adapt the Student Learning Goals for their situations. This frustration was echoed in the surveys and interviews with specialist teachers and non-teaching staff whose goals could not easily be connected to a wider building goal and whose number of students made designating Student Learning Goals a challenge.

Next Steps. It is important to recognize that the findings in this report are preliminary and only encompass the first steps in the implementation of this Model. Since the data cited in this report were collected, school districts/charter school have been making progress on their Pilot implementation. Therefore, conclusions should not be over-generalized based on the information provided in this report. School districts/charter school are progressing through the Pilot at different paces and working to complete implementation of the Pilot by the end of the school year. The Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement will continue to collect data on the Pilot implementation throughout the remainder of the school year and a final report will be available in August 2014.

Appendices

	Page
Appendix A: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Instrument	59
Appendix B: Teacher Implementation Survey Instrument	65
Appendix C: Teacher Beliefs Survey Instrument	74
Appendix D: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Response Rate Information	77
Appendix E: Teacher Implementation Survey Response Rate Information	78
Appendix F: Teacher Beliefs Survey Response Rate Information	79
Appendix G: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Item Response Frequency Tables.....	80
Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Response Frequency Tables	92
Appendix I: Participating Districts Map	106
Appendix J: Summative Evaluator Interview Protocol.....	107
Appendix K: Teacher Interview Protocol	110

Appendix A: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Instrument

Welcome to the Summative Evaluator Survey

This survey is to be completed by summative evaluators in school districts that are piloting the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model. **If you are not a summative evaluator in your district, please do not complete the survey.**

Because school districts are piloting different components of the Model, you will be asked to complete only the parts of the survey that apply to your district. Here is an overview. (Note that this information will be repeated in the survey.)

A. Information about Your Building: All Districts

B. Individual Growth and Development Plans: Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island

C. Student Learning Goals: Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island, Pine River-Backus, Prior Lake/Savage, Red Wing, Wabasha-Kellogg

D. Communication and Training: All Districts

E. Other Activities: All Districts

F. Satisfaction with the Model, Communication, and Training: All Districts

Please note that this survey might not work properly on smart phones.

A. Information about Your Building

Part A to be completed by: **All Districts**

If you are serving as a summative evaluator in only one building in your district, please answer Questions 1-3 for just that building. If you are serving as a summative evaluator in more than one building, please answer Questions 1-3 in terms of ALL those buildings combined.

1. How many summative evaluators are there in the building(s) for which you are serving as a summative evaluator?

2. How many teachers in your building(s) are participating in the Pilot this year (2013-2014)?

Please enter the number of teachers.

3. What grades are housed in your building(s)? (Check all that apply)

☐

K

☐

5

☐

10

☐

1

☐

6

☐

11

☐

2

☐

7

☐

12

☐

3

☐

8

☐

Other

☐

4

☐

9

If other, please specify

Pilot Activities

When you respond to the questions in the following sections, please think about the activities that, to date, YOU personally have spent time on.

B. Individual Growth and Development Plans

Part B to be completed by: **Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island**

4. If you are not in one of these districts, click 'Go to Part C' and 'Next'. Otherwise, just click 'Next'.

Go to Part C

B. Individual Growth and Development Plans (continued)

5. How many teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans have you reviewed and approved?

Number of teachers

6. How many hours have you spent reviewing and approving teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans?

Number of hours

7. For how many participating teachers have you decided on points of contact?

Number of teachers

8. For how many participating teachers have you carried out any points of contact and completed a Points of Contact form?

Number of teachers

9. What is your best estimate of the total hours you have spent working on points of contact?

Number of hours

C. Student Learning Goals

Part C to be completed by: **Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island, Pine River-Backus, Prior Lake/Savage, Red Wing, Wabasha-Kellogg**

10. If you are not in one of these districts, click 'Go to Part D' and 'Next'. Otherwise, just click 'Next'.

Go to Part D

C. Student Learning Goals (continued)

11. How many teachers' Student Learning Goals forms have you reviewed and approved?

Number of teachers

12. What is your best estimate of the total hours you have spent working on teachers' Student Learning Goals forms?

Number of hours

D. Communication and Training

Part D to be completed by: **All Districts**

This section contains questions about how you and the teachers in your building(s) are being informed about the Pilot implementation process.

TRAINING AND INFORMATION SESSIONS

13. What types of training and information sessions have taken place for the teachers participating in the Pilot? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ MDE training sessions
- ☐ District-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot
- ☐ Building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot
- ☐ PLC and/or grade-level meetings related to the Pilot
- ☐ Other (please specify)

14. How much time have YOU personally spent in MDE information and/or planning sessions?

Number of hours

15. How much time have YOU personally spent attending MDE summative evaluator training sessions?

Number of hours

16. How much time have YOU personally spent attending MDE teacher training sessions?

Number of hours

17. How much time have YOU personally spent attending district-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot?

Number of hours

18. How much time have YOU personally spent attending building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot?

Number of hours

19. How much time have YOU personally spent attending PLC and/or grade level meetings related to the Pilot?

Number of hours

20. How much time have YOU personally spent attending any other sessions or meetings related to the Pilot? Please briefly describe the type of session or meeting and include your best estimate of the number of hours spent.

TRAINING AND INFORMATION MATERIALS

21. Have you personally developed any materials (e.g., memos, announcements) to inform teachers about the Pilot?

☐ Yes

☐ No

22. If yes, what is your best estimate of the total hours you have spent developing these materials?

Estimated number of hours

E. Other Activities

Part E to be completed by: **All Districts**

23. Briefly describe any other activities you have spent time on related to the Pilot. Please include your best estimate of the total hours you have spent to date on each activity.

F. Satisfaction with the Model

Part F to be completed by: **All Districts**

24. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	N/A
Specialist teachers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Probationary teachers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mid-career teachers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Late-career teachers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Part-time teachers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teachers who teach in more than one school in the district?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

25. Overall, how satisfied are you with the training you have received from MDE for the Pilot?

- ☐ Very dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ N/A

Please explain your response:

26. Overall, how satisfied are you with the communication you have had with MDE staff regarding the Pilot?

- ☐ Very dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ N/A

Please explain your response:

27. Based on your experiences to date, how satisfied are you, overall, with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model?

- ☐ Very dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very satisfied

Please explain your response:

28. Based on your experiences to date, how would you rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance?

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ No opinion

Please explain your response:

29. Please use the space below to write any comments or suggestions you have about the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model.

Thank you for participating in this survey!

Appendix B: Teacher Implementation Survey Instrument

General Instructions

This survey is to be completed by teachers in school districts that are piloting the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model. **If you are not a teacher, please do not complete the survey.**

Because school districts are piloting different components of the Model, you will be asked to complete only the parts of the survey that apply to your district. Here is an overview. (Note that this information will be repeated in the survey.)

- A. Individual Growth and Development Plan:** Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island
- B. Student Engagement:** Caledonia, Deer River, Detroit Lakes, Granada Huntley, Montevideo, North Shore, Orono, Perpich, Pine Island, Pine River-Backus, Red Wing, Saint James, Saint Peter, Wabasha-Kellogg
- C. Student Learning Goals:** Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island, Pine River-Backus, Prior Lake/Savage, Red Wing, Wabasha-Kellogg
- D. Overall Satisfaction:** All Districts
- E. Background Information:** All Districts

Please note that this survey might not work properly on smart phones.

A. Individual Growth and Development Plan (Questions 2-17)

Part A (Questions 2-17) to be completed by: **Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island**

1. If you are not one of these districts, click Go to Part B and Next. Otherwise, just click Next.

☐ Go to Part B

A (continued)

Part A questions are related to your Individual Growth and Development Plan (the "Plan"). We would like your assistance in evaluating the usefulness of the elements included in the Plan.

2. As of today, how much of the Plan have you completed?

- ☐ None
- ☐ Less than half
- ☐ More than half
- ☐ All

3. To date, how much time have you spent preparing your Plan? Give your best estimate.

A (continued)

4. When working on your plan, did you refer to these items?

	Yes	No
District goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional learning community (PLC) goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A (continued). Your opinion about resources and activities related to the P...

5. The *Teacher Development, Evaluation and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook* provided adequate guidance for developing my Plan.

☐ Completely untrue

☐ Somewhat untrue

☐ Neither untrue nor true

☐ Somewhat true

☐ Completely true

☐ Did not use the Handbook

6. The MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing my Plan.

☐ Completely untrue

☐ Somewhat untrue

☐ Neither untrue nor true

☐ Somewhat true

☐ Completely true

☐ Did not attend the MDE training

7. I found writing my professional growth goal(s) to be

☐ Very difficult

☐ Somewhat difficult

☐ Neither easy nor difficult

☐ Somewhat easy

☐ Very easy

☐ Have not written my professional growth goals

8. I found writing the performance standard(s) for my goals to be

- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Somewhat difficult
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy
- ☐ Have not written the performance standard(s)

9. Formulating my professional growth goals helped me to reflect on my instructional practice.

- ☐ Completely untrue
- ☐ Somewhat untrue
- ☐ Neither untrue nor true
- ☐ Somewhat true
- ☐ Completely true
- ☐ N/A

10. In formulating my Plan, I consulted with

	Yes	No
A peer reviewer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A summative evaluator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No one; I wrote them on my own	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other, please specify

11. In formulating my Plan, it was beneficial to consult with:

	Yes	No	N/A
A peer reviewer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A summative evaluator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A (continued). Points of Contact

12. Have you and a peer reviewer decided on any of your points of contact?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

13. To date, have any points of contact between you and your peer reviewer taken place?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

14. Have you and your summative evaluator decided on any of your points of contact?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

15. To date, have any points of contact between you and your summative evaluator taken place?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

A (continued). Performance Standards for Teacher Practice

16. The *Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric* was an effective tool for identifying areas of my practice for professional growth.

- ☐ Completely untrue
- ☐ Somewhat untrue
- ☐ Neither untrue nor true
- ☐ Somewhat true
- ☐ Completely true
- ☐ N/A

17. The *Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric* was an effective tool for identifying areas of my practice for evaluation.

- ☐ Completely untrue
- ☐ Somewhat untrue
- ☐ Neither untrue nor true
- ☐ Somewhat true
- ☐ Completely true
- ☐ N/A

B. Student Engagement (Questions 19-20)

Part B (Questions 19-20) to be completed by: **Caledonia, Deer River, Detroit Lakes, Granada Huntley, Montevideo, North Shore, Orono, Perpich, Pine Island, Pine River-Backus, Red Wing, Saint James, Saint Peter, Wabasha-Kellogg**

18. If you are not one of these districts, click Go to Part C and Next. Otherwise, just click Next.

B (continued)

19. What methods will you use to assess student engagement?

- ☐ MDE Student Engagement Survey
- ☐ Observation
- ☐ Student portfolios
- ☐ Student presentations/performances/projects
- ☐ Teacher portfolio
- ☐ Video
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Haven't decided yet

If other, please specify

20. To date, how much time have you spent working on the assessment of student engagement? Give your best estimate.

C. Student Learning Goals (Questions 22-31)

Part C (Questions 22-31) to be completed by: **Caledonia, Granada Huntley, Lester Prairie, New Ulm, North Shore, Perpich, Pine Island, Pine River-Backus, Prior Lake/Savage, Red Wing, Wabasha-Kellogg**

21. If you are not one of these districts, click Go to Part D and Next. Otherwise, just click Next.

C (continued)

22. As of today, how far along are you in the student learning goals process? (Check all that have been completed.)

- ☐ I have selected or developed a quality assessment.
- ☐ I have established a mastery score for the assessment.
- ☐ I have established student starting points.
- ☐ I have set student learning goal(s).
- ☐ I have shared student learning goals(s) with the summative evaluator.
- ☐ None of these have been completed.

23. To date, how much time have you spent working on your student learning goals? Give your best estimate.

C (continued). Your opinion about resources and activities related to stude...

24. The *Student Learning Goals Handbook* provided adequate guidance for developing my student learning goals.

- ☐ Completely untrue
- ☐ Somewhat untrue
- ☐ Neither untrue nor true
- ☐ Somewhat true
- ☐ Completely true
- ☐ Did not use the Handbook

25. The MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing my student learning goals.

- ☐ Completely untrue
- ☐ Somewhat untrue
- ☐ Neither untrue nor true
- ☐ Somewhat true
- ☐ Completely true
- ☐ Did not attend the MDE training

26. I found selecting or developing assessments to measure the goals to be

- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Somewhat difficult
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy
- ☐ Have not selected or developed assessments

27. I found establishing mastery scores for the assessment to be

- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Somewhat difficult
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy
- ☐ Have not developed mastery scores

28. I found establishing student starting points to be

- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Somewhat difficult
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy
- ☐ Have not developed my student starting points

29. I found setting student learning goals to be

- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Somewhat difficult
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy
- ☐ Have not developed student learning goals

30. In formulating my student learning goals, I consulted with:

- ☐ A peer reviewer
- ☐ A summative evaluator
- ☐ Other
- ☐ No one; I wrote them on my own

If other, please specify

31. In formulating my student learning goals, it was beneficial to consult with

	Yes	No	N/A
A peer reviewer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A summative evaluator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other, please specify

D. Overall Evaluation

All Districts

32. Based on your experiences to date, how satisfied are you, overall, with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model?

- ☐ Very dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Very Satisfied

33. Based on your experiences to date, how would you rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance?

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ No Opinion

34. Please use the space below to write any comments or suggestions you have regarding the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model.

E. Background Informaton

All Districts

35. Please select your district:

36. Grades you are teaching this school year (check all that apply)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> K | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> 12 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | |

37. Subjects you are teaching this year

38. Your total number of years teaching in this district (do not include this year)

If more than 20, please specify

39. Your total number of years teaching (do not include this year)

If more than 20, please specify

Thank you for participating in this survey!

Appendix C: Teacher Beliefs Survey Instrument

TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT STUDENT ENGAGEMENT MEASURES SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to gather information on teachers' beliefs about the value of student engagement in evaluating teacher practice. Teacher input is critical to the development of student engagement measures so that those measures can be authentic and valued by teachers. The survey results will be used by MDE to shape the teacher development, evaluation and peer support model that will eventually be made available to districts across the state.

Your individual survey responses will be kept confidential. Only researchers at the University of Minnesota's Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) will have access to your individual survey results. CAREI will combine your responses with responses from other Minnesota teachers and provide an aggregate report to MDE.

The survey will be repeated next spring to determine how teachers' beliefs might have changed during their participation in the pilot. We ask you to provide your name so that we can match your responses on the two surveys.

If you have any questions about this survey or CAREI's study of the *Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model* pilot, feel free to contact Deb Ingram at d-ingram@umn.edu or 612.625.0502.



TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT STUDENT ENGAGEMENT MEASURES SURVEY

As part of the pilot for the *Minnesota State Teacher, Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model*, schools will be administering a student survey to gather student feedback about their experiences with specific teachers related to seven constructs: academic engagement (extent to which students are meeting grade level expectations), behavioral engagement (level students are participating in class and are on-task), affective engagement (students feel connected and identify with the class), cognitive engagement (self-regulating and see value in learning), relationship building, rigorous instruction, and relevant instruction. Teachers and evaluators will get the results of the student survey for use in teacher development and evaluation.

NAME (First, Last) _____

SCHOOL NAME(S) _____

SCHOOL DISTRICT _____

A. USEFULNESS OF A STUDENT SURVEY TO MEASURE ENGAGEMENT

DIRECTIONS. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the statements below by filling in the appropriate oval.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEITHER DISAGREE NOR AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. Student surveys will provide me with feedback that will enable me to identify strengths and weaknesses in my teaching methods.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Student surveys will provide me with information that will enable me to improve my effectiveness as a teacher.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Responses that my students give on the student survey can accurately predict how well they do on learning performance measures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I am in favor of using feedback from student surveys to evaluate my teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Students in the grades and subjects that I teach can discriminate between effective and ineffective teaching behaviors.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Student surveys are not worth administering because I can easily influence students so they give positive ratings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. It will take a lot of time for me to review the results of my students' surveys in order to make them useful.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Feedback from student surveys can help my school identify areas where teachers need professional development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Feedback from student surveys can be used to track changes in my teaching performance over time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Surveying my students is worth the time it takes to administer the survey.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. I am concerned that students will give low ratings in a subject that is difficult for them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. I am concerned that students will use the survey to get back at teachers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

© 2013 Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement

Continue on other side



1



TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT STUDENT ENGAGEMENT MEASURES SURVEY

B. INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHER RESPONDENT

13. Grade(s) you will teach this school year.

(Fill in all that apply):

- ☐ K
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10
☐ 11
☐ 12
☐ Other: _____

14. Please indicate your total number of years

teaching in this district (Do *not* include this year):

- ☐ 0
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9

15. Subject(s) you will be teaching this school year.

16. Please indicate your total number of years teaching (Do *not* include this year):

- ☐ 0
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9

17. I am:

- ☐ Female
☐ Male



Appendix D: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Response Rate Information

Response Rates for Summative Evaluators Participating in the Fall 2013 Summative Evaluator Survey

Number of surveys sent	Number of surveys returned	Response Rate
37	25	67.6%

Number of districts that participated = 13

Appendix E: Teacher Implementation Survey Response Rate Information

Response Rates for Teachers Participating in the Fall 2013 Teacher Survey

Number of surveys sent	Number of surveys returned ^a	Response Rate
714	273	38.2%

^aThe total number of surveys returned did not include the 20 surveys that were completed by non-teachers.

Number of districts that participated = 14

Appendix F: Teacher Beliefs Survey Response Rate Information

Response Rates for School Districts Participating in the Fall 2013 Teacher Beliefs Survey

District/School	Number of teachers	Number of surveys returned	Response Rate	Method of delivering surveys	Method of returning surveys
Caledonia Public School District	52	48	92%	Hand delivered by MDE	Collected by MDE
Deer River Public School District	72	69	96%	Hand delivered by MDE	MDE
Detroit Lakes Public School District	65	a	a	Mailed	Mailed (not received)
Granada Huntley-East Chain	22	20	91%	Hand delivered by MDE	Collected by MDE
Montevideo Public School District	110	85	77%	Mailed	Mailed
North Shore Community School	22	22	100%	Hand delivered by MDE	Collected by MDE
Orono Public School District	195	155	79%	Hand delivered by CAREI	Mailed
Perpich Center for Arts Education	28	24	86%	Hand delivered by CAREI	Collected by CAREI
Pine Island Public School District	90	81	90%	Hand delivered by MDE	Collected by MDE
Pine River-Backus School District	31	31	100%	Mailed	Mailed
Red Wing Public School District	225	169	75%	Mailed	Mailed
St. Peter Public School District	150	146	97%	Mailed	Mailed
Wabasha-Kellogg Public School District	50	47	94%	Mailed	Mailed
Total	1,047*	897*	86%*		

^aConversation with a Detroit Lakes administrator confirmed that the surveys were mailed back to CAREI in September 2013, but the surveys were never received.

^bThe totals do not include Detroit Lakes Public School District.

School districts participating in the student engagement pilot that did not participate in the fall 2013 teacher beliefs survey: New Ulm Public School District and St. James Public School District.

Appendix G: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables**A. Information about Your Building**

Q1. How many summative evaluators are there in the building(s) for which you are serving as a summative evaluator?

No. of Summative Evaluators	Frequency	%
1	14	56.0
2	8	32.0
3	0	0.0
4	1	4.0
More than 4	2	8.0
Total Respondents	25	100.0

Q2. How many teachers in your building(s) are participating in the Pilot this year (2013-2014)

No. of Teachers	Frequency	%
1-10	6	24.0
11-20	2	8.0
21-30	6	24.0
31-40	5	20.0
41-50	2	8.0
51-60	2	8.0
More than 60	2	8.0
Total Respondents	25	100.0

Minimum = 4, Maximum = 90, Modes = 5, 21, and 38, Mean = 29.92, Standard Deviation = 21.446

Q3. What grades are housed in your building(s) for which you are serving as a summative evaluator?

Grade Level	Frequency	%
PreK-12	5	20.0
PreK-3	1	4.0
PreK-5, 7-12+ (transition)	1	4.0
K-2	1	4.0
K-5	3	12.0
K-6	1	4.0
1-3	1	4.0
4-6	1	4.0
4-7	1	4.0
5-7	1	4.0
5-8	1	4.0
6-12	2	8.0
7-12	2	8.0
8-12	2	8.0
9-12	1	4.0
9-12+ (transition)	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

B. Individual Growth and Development Plans

Q5. How many teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans have you reviewed and approved?

No. of Teachers' Plans	Frequency	%
0-9	6	60.0
10-19	0	0.0
20-29	1	10.0
30-39	2	20.0
40-49	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 46, Mode = 0, Mean = 14.10, Standard Deviation = 17.635

Q6. How many hours have you spent reviewing and approving teachers' Individual Growth and Development Plans?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-9	6	60.0
10-19	1	10.0
20-29	1	10.0
30-39	1	10.0
40 and more	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 50, Mode = 0, Mean = 12.40, Standard Deviation = 16.761

Q7. For how many participating teachers have you decided on points of contact?

No. of Teachers	Frequency	%
0-9	5	50.0
10-19	1	10.0
20-29	1	10.0
30-39	0	0.0
40-49	1	10.0
50-59	1	10.0
60 and more	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 64, Mode = 0, Mean = 19.40, Standard Deviation = 23.829

Q8. For how many participating teachers have you carried out any points of contact and completed a points of contact form?

No. of Teachers	Frequency	%
0	7	70.0
1	1	10.0
2	0	0.0
3	0	0.0
4	0	0.0
5	0	0.0
6	1	10.0
7	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 7, Mode = 0, Mean = 1.40, Standard Deviation = 2.716

Q9. What is your best estimate of the total hours you have spent working on points of contact?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-4	3	30.0
5-9	2	20.0
10-14	1	10.0
15-19	3	30.0
20-24	0	0.0
25-29	1	10.0
Total Respondents	10	100.0

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 28, Mode = 0, Mean = 9.90, Standard Deviation = 9.085

C. Student Learning Goals

Q11. How many teachers' Student Learning Goals forms have you reviewed and approved?

No. of Teachers' Forms	Frequency	%
0-4	12	70.6
5-9	2	11.8
10-14	0	0.0
15-19	0	0.0
20-24	1	5.9
25-29	0	0.0
30 and more	2	11.8
Total Respondents	17	100.1

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 40, Mode = 0, Mean = 6.71, Standard Deviation = 12.429

Q12. What is your best estimate of the total hours you have spent working on teachers' Student Learning Goals forms?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-4	10	58.8
5-9	1	5.9
10-14	2	11.8
15-19	1	5.9
20-24	2	11.8
25-29	0	0.0
30 and more	1	5.9
Total Respondents	17	100.1

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 40, Mode = 0, Mean = 7.88, Standard Deviation = 10.902

D. Communication and Training

Q13. What types of training and information sessions have taken place for the teachers participating in the Pilot (Check all that apply)

Responses	Frequency	%
MDE training sessions	18	72.0
District-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot	20	80.0
Building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot	17	68.0
PLC and/or grade-level meetings related to the Pilot	18	72.0
Other (please specify)	0	0.0
No training and information sessions indicated	2	8.0
Total Respondents	25	

Q14. How much time have YOU personally spent in MDE information and/or planning sessions?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-4	5	21.7
5-9	3	13.0
10-14	1	4.3
15-19	3	13.0
20-24	5	21.7
25-29	0	0.0
30-34	3	13.0
35-39	0	0.0
40 and more	3	13.0
Total Respondents	23	99.7

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 60, Mode = 20, Mean = 18.26, Standard Deviation = 15.094

Q15. How much time have YOU personally spent attending MDE summative evaluator training sessions?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	7	30.4
3-5	3	13.0
6-8	7	30.4
9-11	3	13.0
12-14	1	4.3
15 and more	2	8.7
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 16, Mode = 0, 8, Mean = 6.17, Standard Deviation = 4.924

Q16. How much time have YOU personally spent attending MDE teacher training sessions?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	9	39.1
3-5	4	17.4
6-8	3	13.0
9-11	3	13.0
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	1	4.3
18-20	1	4.3
21 and more	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.7

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 24, Mode = 0, Mean = 6.26, Standard Deviation = 6.804

Q17. How much time have YOU personally spent attending district-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	4	17.4
3-5	6	26.1
6-8	4	17.4
9-11	1	4.3
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	2	8.7
18-20	2	8.7
21 and more	3	13.0
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 75, Mode = 6, Mean = 12.43, Standard Deviation = 16.541

Q18. How much time have YOU personally spent attending building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	10	43.5
3-5	4	17.4
6-8	4	17.4
9-11	3	13.0
12-14	0	0.0
15-17	1	4.3
18-20	0	0.0
21 and more	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 25, Mode = 0, Mean = 5.26, Standard Deviation = 6.039

Appendix G: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Q19. How much time have YOU personally spent attending PLC and/or grade level meetings related to the Pilot?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	13	56.5
3-5	4	17.4
6-8	2	8.7
9-11	2	8.7
12-14	1	4.3
15-17	0	0.0
18-20	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 20, Mode = 0, Mean = 4.04, Standard Deviation = 5.013

Q20: How much time have YOU personally spent attending any other sessions or meetings related to the Pilot? Please briefly describe the type of session or meeting and include your best estimate of the number of hours spent.

- 10+
- 4
- 4 hours – Most have been online trainings that focused on evaluation platforms.
- 6 hours at a Marzano training
- 8 --- MN Assessment --- training at district site by MDE personnel --- trainings with the PLC Coordinator
- Administrative meetings-8
- Statewide meetings on the reqs for the teacher pilot. 6-hours

Q21. Have you personally developed any materials (e.g., memos, announcements) to inform teachers about the Pilot?

Responses	Frequency	%
Yes	15	65.2
No	8	34.8
Total Respondents	23	100.0

Q22. If yes, what is your best estimate of the total hours you have spent developing these materials?

Hours	Frequency	%
0-2	7	41.2
3-5	5	29.4
6-8	2	11.8
9-11	1	5.9
12-14	0	0.0
15-17	1	5.9
18-20	1	5.9
Total Respondents	17	100.1

Minimum = 0, Maximum = 20, Mode = 2, 3, Mean = 5.00, Standard Deviation = 5.511

E. Other Activities

Q23: Briefly describe any other activities you have spent time on related to the Pilot. Please include your best estimate of the total hours you have spent to date on each activity.

- Administration meetings and team committee meetings within the school district. Planning, discussion, budgets, and time-lines
- BloomBoard program 4 hrs., Student Surveys 2 hrs.
- Completing observations ... an extremely complex system taking a significant amount of time compared to previous district formal observation requirements [over 4 hours per observation] with 5 observations to date
- District team meetings 16 hours
- Email and contact teachers. Helping individual teachers with BloomBoard and internet related activities.
- Discussion with teachers on teacher evaluation law and how it relates to the pilot. Law meeting with MESPA on discussion of teacher evaluation. 15 hours
- I did attend my first activity this past summer in [district's name]. That was the first introduction I had to being a summative evaluator. I will be helping with the summative evaluations for some of the teaching staff. I do not see myself heavily involved in the summative activities as it has been described to me by my superior.
- I have spent time on the district planning committee - 30 hours
- Learning the Framework (32 hours) Planning PD relative to the framework not the pilot itself (8 hours) Typing up Google forms about the framework (3 hours)
- Most of my time involving other activities would include individual and whole group meetings with teachers, meeting with the other summative evaluator in our district, completing the grant process, keeping the school board informed, responding to emails and taking part in webinars and surveys, and creating online evaluation documents for our district to use to help mainstream the process.
- pre obs 15 obs 30 post obs 15
- Reviewed teacher proposed plans for implementation - 15 minutes
- We are using BloomBoard. I am disappointed in the fact that there has been very little training for me a summative evaluator. It would have been nice to know how to use BloomBoard, how to use the forms, forms that were designed for me as a building and forms that were also interactive and not pdf only forms.
- Webinars relating to the student survey with MDE. Meetings with the district leadership team charged with implementation of our teacher evaluation Model. 4

Minimum = 15 minutes, Maximum = 60 hours, Mean = 22.41, Standard deviation = 20.842

F. Satisfaction with the Model

Q24a. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating specialist teachers?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	7	30.4
Fair	7	30.4
Good	7	30.4
Very good	0	0.0
Excellent	0	0.0
N/A	2	8.7
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Appendix G: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Q24b. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating probationary teachers?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	0	0.0
Fair	7	30.4
Good	3	13.0
Very good	10	43.5
Excellent	2	8.7
N/A	1	4.3
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Q24c. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating mid-career teachers?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	1	4.3
Fair	2	8.7
Good	11	47.8
Very good	8	34.8
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	0	0.0
Total Respondents	23	99.9

Q24d. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating late-career teachers?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	1	4.3
Fair	3	13.0
Good	9	39.1
Very good	9	39.1
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	0	0.0
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Q24e. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating part-time teachers?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	2	8.7
Fair	5	21.7
Good	7	30.4
Very good	3	13.0
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	5	21.7
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Q24f. From your perspective, how well does the Model seem to work for evaluating teachers who teach in more than one school in the district?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	3	13.0
Fair	5	21.7
Good	6	26.1
Very good	3	13.0
Excellent	1	4.3
N/A	5	21.7
Total Respondents	23	99.8

Q25. Overall, how satisfied are you with the training you have received from MDE for the Pilot?

Responses	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	3	12.5
Dissatisfied	3	12.5
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	1	4.2
Satisfied	13	54.2
Very satisfied	3	12.5
N/A	1	4.2
Total Respondents	24	100.0

Q25: Overall, how satisfied are you with the training you have received from MDE for the Pilot? Please explain your response:

- I don't feel there is any depth in the rubric. I can't use the rubric to offer ideas for how teachers can improve their teaching.
- I find it cumbersome. The 4 choices do not offer a sound representation of a teacher.
- I haven't had any
- I was not part of the ""team"" that received training.
- Initially, a bit overwhelming... getting better. Superintendent was very good.
- More training still to come to help complete this procedure with the aim of doing it right.
- No training for me as a summative evaluator
- The MDE has been helpful and returns correspondence promptly. The trainings have been useful but overall too quick and short.
- The plan is cumbersome without clarity. The training has been fine based on the existing plan. There would be great benefit to streamlining.
- The training has been good. The lack of time to do sufficient training is a huge barrier.
- Trainers have helped, but it seems to be a work in progress rather than a specific plan
- We are only participating in the survey. We have been kept informed by the MDE staff
- We have had great training and support from MDE trainers.

Q26. Overall, how satisfied are you with the communication you have had with MDE staff regarding the Pilot?

Responses	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	1	4.2
Dissatisfied	2	8.3
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	7	29.2
Satisfied	5	20.8
Very satisfied	7	29.2
N/A	2	8.3
Total Respondents	24	100.0

Q26: Overall, how satisfied are you with the communication you have had with MDE staff regarding the Pilot? Please explain your response:

- Haven't had any
- Most of the communication has been through our superintendent.
- Quick correspondence.
- The staff from MDE has bent over backwards to be of help.
- The training is designed to be ""just in time,"" but it has felt like surprises along the way.
- Trainers have been very receptive to any questions.
- We are only participating in the survey. We have been kept informed by the MDE staff

Q27. Based on your experiences to date, how satisfied are you, overall, with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model?

Responses	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	1	4.2
Dissatisfied	4	16.7
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	12	50.0
Satisfied	5	20.8
Very satisfied	2	8.3
N/A	0	0.0
Total Respondents	24	100.0

Q27: Based on your experiences to date, how satisfied are you, overall, with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model? Please explain your response:

- I think it has huge potential. As is usually the case, neither the training nor the preparation time has been sufficient.
- It is helping our staff to communicate more.
- It's too soon to judge. If the peer part is implemented it will be great, otherwise it is the same as what I have always done.
- Lots of uncertainty
- The amount of time involved for what you get from it is not a good ratio.
- The general belief is that this is just another attempt by non-educators to rank order educators with the sole purpose of reinforcing a negative image of the educational profession,
- Too complex and too many pages to sort through. Having some training could have helped sort through the junk and determine areas that are important and those that are just too cumbersome.
- We are in the process of developing our own Model.

Q28. Based on your experiences to date, how would you rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance?

Responses	Frequency	%
Poor	2	8.3
Fair	6	25.0
Good	9	37.5
Very good	4	16.7
Excellent	0	0.0
No opinion	3	12.5
Total Respondents	24	100.0

Q28: Based on your experiences to date, how would you rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance? Please explain your response:

- An evaluator is given only 4 options with 2 being highly negative and one being impossible to obtain unless one's class was composed entirely of AP students. There is no room in the evaluation to deal with students who struggle or for teachers who work at the middle level [4 - 9 grades]
- I need to find the validation of the passion, desire and day to day effort of the classroom teacher.
- I think the discussions that I have with staff are the prize possessions of the processes. There is too much and too complicated paperwork that goes with it that consumes too much time.
- It is not any better than our current Model.
- It is too cumbersome and we are only completing part of the training. Hardly any staff members know the 86 page document and have time to read it.
- Once we are able to move from Danielson to Marzano, I think this will become a more powerful process.
- Still learning.
- too complicated
- We are participating in one component of the Model, Student Learning Goals and it is going well with our teachers in our district.

Q29. Please use the space below to write any comments or suggestions you have about the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model.

- At the end of the day schools are going to meet the minimum standards established in law because the time and cost of the state Model would take time and dollars away from student curriculum.
- I believe that the ongoing support and training provided by MDE and in particular Tyler Livingston has been very good. I also believe that the Model has some very good pieces that will be beneficial in providing teachers with an encompassing evaluation. Finally, I like that the Model provides the flexibility for our district to establish a final product that works for us.
- I need to spend more time in classrooms and less time writing about classroom visits.
- I will feel much more confident once I get trained on the computer program for adding information for the summative reporting.

Appendix G: Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

- It is extremely negative. If a teacher is proficient in all areas but one, then the teacher is categorized as basic. Basic is negatively worded. I find the entire process negative and cumbersome.
- Make it more to the point and less wordy.
- So far, it seems like a very productive and effective Model.
- Summative evaluators need to be trained, independently of the teachers.
- We are following the legislative guidelines, but we still disagree with the amount of focus on student test scores to rate teacher prof growth.

Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Part A. Individual Growth and Development Plan

Q2. As of today, how much of the Plan have you completed?

Response	Frequency	%
None	8	5.9
Less than half	60	44.1
More than half	31	22.8
All	37	27.2
Total	136	100.0

Q3. To date, how much time have you spent preparing your Plan? Give your best estimate.

Response	Frequency	%
1 hour or less	38	27.7
2 hours	29	21.2
3 hours	23	16.8
4 hours	10	7.3
5 hours	10	7.3
6 to 7 hours	5	3.6
8 to 9 hours	6	4.4
10 to 11 hours	3	2.2
12 to 13 hours	3	2.2
14 to 15 hours	1	0.7
16 to 17 hours	3	2.2
18 to 19 hours	0	0.0
20 hours or more	6	4.4
Total	137	100.0

Q4a. When working on your Plan, did you refer to your district goals?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	103	75.2
No	34	24.8
Total	137	100.0

Q4b. When working on your Plan, did you refer to your school goals?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	112	81.8
No	25	18.2
Total	137	100.0

Q4c. When working on your Plan, did you refer to your PLC goals?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	106	77.4
No	31	22.6
Total	137	100.0

Q5. The *Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook* provided adequate guidance for developing my Plan.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	4	3.0
Somewhat untrue	7	5.2
Neither untrue nor true	14	10.4
Somewhat true	63	46.7
Completely true	19	14.1
Did not use the Handbook	28	20.7
Total	135	100.1

Q6. The MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing my Plan.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	6	4.4
Somewhat untrue	22	16.2
Neither untrue nor true	7	5.1
Somewhat true	63	46.3
Completely true	1	14.0
Did not attend the MDE training	19	14.0
Total	136	100.0

Q7. I found writing my professional growth goal(s) to be

Response	Frequency	%
Very difficult	9	6.7
Somewhat difficult	49	36.6
Neither easy nor difficult	26	19.4
Somewhat easy	34	25.4
Very easy	9	6.7
Have not written my professional growth goals	7	5.2
Total	134	100.0

Q8. I found writing the performance standard(s) for my goals to be

Response	Frequency	%
Very difficult	8	5.9
Somewhat difficult	51	37.5
Neither easy nor difficult	32	23.5
Somewhat easy	24	17.6
Very easy	9	6.6
Have not written the performance standard(s)	12	8.8
Total	136	100.0

Q9. Formulating my professional growth goals helped me to reflect on my instructional practice.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	1	0.7
Somewhat untrue	12	8.9
Neither untrue nor true	14	10.4
Somewhat true	69	51.1
Completely true	35	25.9
N/A	4	3.0
Total	135	100.0

Q10a. In formulating my Plan, I consulted with a peer reviewer.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	75	62.5
No	45	37.5
Total	120	100.0

Q10b. In formulating my Plan, I consulted with a summative evaluator.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	32	28.6
No	80	71.4
Total	112	100.0

Q10c. In formulating my Plan, I consulted with other.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	32	36.0
No	57	64.0
Total	89	100.0

Q10c. In formulating my Plan, I consulted with other.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	6	6.7
Other write-in consultants		
- Fellow teacher(s)/colleague(s)	8	9.0
- PLC	10	11.2
- Department members	2	2.2
- Spouse	2	2.2
- Other ^a	4	4.5
No	57	64.0
Total	89	99.8

^aResponses include other write-in consultants that occurred only once

Q10d. In formulating my Plan, I consulted with no one; I wrote them on my own.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	43	55.1
No	35	44.9
Total	78	100.0

Q11a. In formulating my Plan, it was beneficial to consult with a peer reviewer.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	76	60.8
No	11	8.8
N/A	38	30.4
Total	125	100.0

Q11b. In formulating my Plan, it was beneficial to consult with a summative evaluator.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	35	30.2
No	24	20.7
N/A	57	49.1
Total	116	100.0

Q11c. In formulating my Plan, it was beneficial to consult with other.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	31	32.0
No	15	15.5
N/A	51	52.6
Total	97	100.0

Q11c. In formulating my Plan, it was beneficial to consult with other.

Response	It was beneficial to consult with other.	Other write-in response					Total
		Fellow teacher(s)/colleague(s)	PLC	Department members	Spouse	Other	
Yes	9 (9.3%)	8 (8.2%)	9 (9.3%)	1 (1.0%)	2(2.1%)	2 (2.1%)	31
No	14 (14.4%)		1 (1.0%)				15
N/A	50 (51.5%)					1 (1.0%)	51
Total	73	8	10	1	2	2	97

Q12. Have you and a peer reviewer decided on any of your points of contact?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	81	59.6
No	55	40.4
Total	136	100.0

Q13. To date, have any points of contact between you and your peer reviewer taken place?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	52	38.2
No	83	61.0
N/A	1	0.7
Total	136	100.0

Q14. Have you and your summative evaluator decided on any of your points of contact?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	49	36.0
No	87	64.0
Total	136	100.0

Q15. To date, have any points of contact between you and your summative evaluator taken place?

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	32	23.9
No	99	73.9
N/A	3	2.2
Total	134	100.0

Q16. The Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric was an effective tool for identifying areas of my practice for professional growth.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	7	5.2
Somewhat untrue	16	11.9
Neither untrue nor true	19	14.1
Somewhat true	70	51.9
Completely true	20	14.8
N/A	3	2.2
Total	135	100.0

Q17. The Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric was an effective tool for identifying areas of my practice for evaluation.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	7	5.2
Somewhat untrue	24	17.8
Neither untrue nor true	16	11.9
Somewhat true	68	50.4
Completely true	16	11.9
N/A	4	3.0
Total	135	100.0

Part B. Student Engagement

Q19. What methods will you use to assess student engagement? (Check all that apply).

Response	Frequency	%
MDE Student Engagement Survey	47	26.6
Observation	107	60.5
Student portfolios	20	11.3
Student presentations/performances/projects	70	39.5
Teacher portfolio	7	4.0
Video	13	7.3
Haven't decided yet	52	29.4
Other write-in responses		
- Survey other than MDE survey	2	1.1
- Student work and/or test scores	3	1.7
- Student attendance and/or classroom behavior	2	1.1
- Student in-class evaluation response (e.g., thumbs up/down)	2	1.1
- Other ^a	13	4.0
Total respondents	177	*

*Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option as their response

^aResponses include other write-in methods that occurred only once

Q20. To date, how much time have you spent working on the assessment of student engagement? Give your best estimate.

Response	Frequency	%
0 hours	34	19.7
Less than 1 hour	42	24.3
1 hour	13	7.5
2 hours	25	14.5
3 hours	9	5.2
4 hours	11	6.4
5 hours	12	6.9
6 hours	3	1.7
7 hours	1	0.6
8 hours	5	2.9
9 hours	1	0.6
10 hours	4	2.3
12 hours	1	0.6
15 hours	3	1.7
17 hours	1	0.6
20 hours	2	1.2
More than 20 hours	6	3.5
Total	173	100.0

Part C. Student Learning Goals

Q22. As of today, how far along are you in the student learning goals process? (Check all that have been completed.)

Response	Frequency	%
I have selected or developed a quality assessment.	72	44.4
I have established a mastery score for the assessment.	59	36.4
I have established student starting points.	67	41.4
I have set student learning goal(s).	91	56.2
I have shared student learning goals(s) with the summative evaluator.	53	32.7
None of these have been completed.	45	26.5
Total respondents	162	*

*Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option as their response

Q23. To date, how much time have you spent working on your student learning goals? Give your best estimate.

Response	Frequency	%
0 hours	25	16.7
Less than 1 hour	16	10.7
1 hour	20	13.3
2 hours	24	16.0
3 hours	16	10.7
4 hours	10	6.7
5 hours	11	7.3
6 hours	5	3.3
7 hours	3	2.0
8 hours	4	2.7
9 hours	1	0.7
10 hours	4	2.7
11 hours	0	0.0
12 hours	5	3.3
13 hours	0	0.0
14 hours	0	0.0
15 hours	2	1.3
16 hours	0	0.0
17 hours	0	0.0
18 hours	1	0.7
19 hours	0	0.0
20 hours	2	1.3
More than 20 hours	1	0.7
Total	150	100.0

Q24. The Student Learning Goals Handbook provided adequate guidance for developing my student learning goals.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	4	3.0
Somewhat untrue	12	9.0
Neither untrue nor true	24	17.9
Somewhat true	57	42.5
Completely true	7	5.2
Did not use the Handbook	30	22.4
Total	134	100.0

Q25. The MDE training provided adequate guidance for developing my student learning goals.

Response	Frequency	%
Completely untrue	5	3.7
Somewhat untrue	15	11.1
Neither untrue nor true	17	12.6
Somewhat true	65	48.1
Completely true	12	8.9
Did not attend the MDE training	21	15.6
Total	135	100.0

Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Q26. I found selecting or developing assessments to measure the goals to be

Response	Frequency	%
Very difficult	7	5.2
Somewhat difficult	37	27.4
Neither easy nor difficult	22	16.3
Somewhat easy	38	28.1
Very easy	12	8.9
Have not selected or developed assessments	19	14.1
Total	135	100.0

Q27. I found establishing mastery scores for the assessment to be

Response	Frequency	%
Very difficult	9	6.7
Somewhat difficult	35	25.9
Neither easy nor difficult	24	17.8
Somewhat easy	30	22.2
Very easy	11	8.1
Have not developed mastery scores	26	19.3
Total	135	100.0

Q28. I found establishing student starting points to be

Response	Frequency	%
Very difficult	6	4.4
Somewhat difficult	31	22.8
Neither easy nor difficult	28	20.6
Somewhat easy	45	33.1
Very easy	9	6.6
Have not developed my student starting points	17	12.5
Total	136	100.0

Q29. I found setting student learning goals to be

Response	Frequency	%
Very difficult	6	4.4
Somewhat difficult	42	30.9
Neither easy nor difficult	27	19.9
Somewhat easy	43	31.6
Very easy	5	3.7
Have not developed student learning goals	13	9.6
Total	136	100.0

Q30. In formulating my student learning goals, I consulted with:

Response	Frequency	%
A peer reviewer	79	60.3
A summative evaluator	36	27.5
No one; I wrote them on my own	25	19.1
Other write-in consultants		
- Fellow teacher(s)/colleague(s)	10	7.6
- PLC	7	5.3
- Intervention team	5	3.8
- Other ^a	18	13.7
Total	131	*

*Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option as their response

^a Responses include other write-in consultants that occurred only once

Q31a. In formulating my student learning goals, it was beneficial to consult with a peer reviewer.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	84	68.3
No	9	7.3
N/A	30	24.4
Total	123	100.0

Q31b. In formulating my student learning goals, it was beneficial to consult with a summative evaluator.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	41	38.7
No	23	21.7
N/A	42	39.6
Total	106	100.0

Q31c. In formulating my student learning goals, it was beneficial to consult with other.

Response	Frequency	%
Yes	32	36.8
No	8	9.2
N/A	47	54.0
Total	87	100.0

Q32. Based on your experiences to date, how satisfied are you, overall, with the Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model?

Response	Frequency	%
Very dissatisfied	25	9.9
Dissatisfied	51	20.2
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	143	56.5
Satisfied	34	13.4
Total	253	100.0

Q33. Based on your experiences to date, how would you rate the Model's ability to provide a valid assessment of a teacher's performance?

Response	Frequency	%
Poor	49	19.5
Fair	93	37.1
Good	53	21.1
Very Good	8	3.2
Excellent	1	0.4
No Opinion	47	18.7
Total	251	100.0

Q36. Grades you are teaching this school year. (Check all that apply)

Grade Level	Frequency	%
PreK	5	2.0
K	44	16.1
Grade 1	45	16.5
Grade 2	52	19.0
Grade 3	55	20.1
Grade 4	46	16.8
Grade 5	46	16.8
Grade 6	41	15.0
Grade 7	48	17.6
Grade 8	53	19.4
Grade 9	65	23.8
Grade 10	69	25.3
Grade 11	85	31.1
Grade 12	84	30.8
Other	13	4.8
Total respondents	273	*

*Percentages total up to more than 100% because respondents could choose more than one option as their response

Q36. Response summarized by grade level category where ES = Elementary School = K through grade 5, MS = Middle School = grade 6 through grade 8, HS = High School = grade 9 through grade 12, and other includes responses that did not fit into any categories.

Teaching Level	Frequency	%
ES	102	37.4
ES MS	18	6.6
ES MS HS	8	2.9
ES MS HS Other	1	0.4
ES MS Other	2	0.7
ES Other	2	0.7
HS	68	24.9
HS Other	4	1.5
MS	24	8.8
MS HS	39	14.3
PreK	5	1.8
Total	273	100.0

Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Q37. Subjects you are teaching this year.

Subjects	Frequency	%
ELL	1	0.4
ES Regular	78	28.6
ES/MS Core	6	2.2
HS Core	45	16.5
HS Core, Elective	1	0.4
HS Elective	11	4.0
MS	2	0.7
MS Core	18	6.6
MS Core, Elective	1	0.4
MS/HS Core	20	7.3
MS/HS Core, Elective	2	0.7
MS/HS Elective	7	2.6
PreK	5	1.8
Spec Ed	61	22.3
Specialist	15	5.5
Total	273	100.0

Q38. Your total number of years teaching in this district (do not include this year)

Number of Years	Frequency	%
0	21	8.3
1	23	9.1
2	16	6.3
3	11	4.4
4	9	3.6
5	8	3.2
6	16	6.3
7	9	3.6
8	5	2.0
9	9	3.6
10	12	4.8
11	9	3.6
12	3	1.2
13	6	2.4
14	7	2.8
15	6	2.4
16	7	2.8
17	4	1.6
18	5	2.0
19	7	2.8
20	11	4.4
More than 20	48	19.0
Total	252	100.0

Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Q38a. If more than 20, please specify

Number of Years	Frequency	%
21	6	10.7
22	5	8.9
23	3	5.4
24	3	5.4
25	7	12.5
26	4	7.1
27	3	5.4
28	5	8.9
29	5	8.9
30	4	7.1
32	1	1.8
33	1	1.8
34	1	1.8
35	2	3.6
37	2	3.6
39	2	3.6
40	2	3.6
Total	56	100.1

Q39. Your total number of years teaching (do not include this year)

Number of Years	Frequency	%
0	6	2.5
1	9	3.7
2	9	3.7
3	10	4.1
4	8	3.3
5	6	2.5
6	10	4.1
7	11	4.6
8	10	4.1
9	10	4.1
10	5	2.1
11	12	5.0
12	5	2.1
13	11	4.6
14	7	2.9
15	7	2.9
16	3	1.2
17	9	3.7
18	1	0.4
19	6	2.5
20	14	5.8
More than 20	72	29.9
Total	241	100.0

Appendix H: Teacher Implementation Survey Item Frequency Tables

Q39a. If more than 20, please specify

Number of Years	Frequency	%
21	7	8.1
22	3	3.5
23	6	7.0
24	12	14.0
25	6	7.0
26	8	9.3
27	7	8.1
28	5	5.8
29	5	5.8
30	5	5.8
31	3	3.5
32	2	2.3
33	3	3.5
34	4	4.7
36	2	2.3
37	2	2.3
38	1	1.2
39	2	2.3
40	2	2.3
41	1	1.2
Total	86	100.0

Appendix I: Participating Districts



A	Caledonia (Whole Model)
B	Deer River (Student Engagement)
C	Detroit Lakes (Student Engagement)
D	Granada Huntley (Whole Model)
E	Lester Prairie (refer to ● on map) (Teacher Practice)
F	Montevideo (Student Engagement)
G	New Ulm (Whole Model)
H	North Shore Community School (Duluth) (Whole Model)

I	Orono (refer to the ● on the map) (Student Engagement)
J	Perpich Arts High School (refer to ● on the map) (Whole Model)
K	Pine Island (Whole Model)
L	Pine River Backus (Student Engagement & Student Learning Goals)
M	Prior Lake/Savage (Student Learning Goals)
N	Red Wing (Student Engagement & Student Learning Goals)
O	Saint James (Student Engagement)
P	Saint Peter (Student Engagement)
Q	Wabasha-Kellogg (Student Engagement & Student Learning Goals)

Appendix J: Summative Evaluator Interview Protocol

Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model Pilot

Summative Evaluator Interview Questions

November 20, 2013

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of the interview is to collect information about what is working well, what is challenging, and what you are learning about implementing the *Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model* (“the Model”). This work is complex so feedback from individual summative evaluators like you is critical to helping MDE understand how the Model can be improved.

We appreciate your candor. We will combine the information from your interview with information from other interviews in this district and interviews in eight other districts across the state.

In any written or verbal reports based on these data, we will not use your name or the name of your school or district. We may include a direct quote from your interview, but we would not include any information that could be used to identify you, your school, or your district.

May I record your interview? Only the members of the CAREI research team will have access to this recording or the transcript of the recording. All recordings and transcripts will be stored in locked offices in our center.

Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

Interviewer Instructions: Start the recorder and then state your name, the date, the school and the name of the interviewee before you ask the first question.

In case you need to show the interviewee what you’re talking about, a blank Individual Growth and Development Plan, a blank Point of Contact Documentation form, a blank Student Learning Goals Documentation form, and the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric are attached at the end of this interview.

Teacher Practice

*1. What things have you done so far with respect to teachers’ development of their Individual Growth and Development Plans? [If they don’t understand what you’re asking, you can offer examples such as: provide training, encourage teachers to work together, review plans, set a due date.]

*a. What has worked well for you?

*b. What challenges have you encountered?

*c. Was there anything about the forms, the terminology, or the process that was confusing to

you or your teachers?

*If yes, what changes would you suggest to the forms, the terminology, or the process?

*d. Was there anything about the MDE training that was confusing to you or your teachers?

*If yes, how could it be improved?

*2. Are there any types of teachers for whom the Model is not working as well? If yes, which teachers and what is not working well for them? [Types of teachers include: specialist, probationary, mid-career, late-career, part-time, and teachers who teach in more than one school in the district.]

3. Have you completed any points of contact yet?

a. If yes, what kind?

b. If yes, what challenges have you experienced in doing points of contact?

c. If yes, what benefits have you experienced in doing points of contact?

*4. What things have you done so far with respect to setting up the peer review process?

*a. How were peer reviewers identified and assigned to teachers?

*b. What worked well in setting up the peer review process?

*c. What challenges did you encounter in setting up the peer review process?

5. Is your district using iObservation/BloomBoard to support the implementation process?

[**BloomBoard**-Caledonia, Perpich, Pine Island, Lester Prairie. **iObservation**-Granada Huntley East Chain]

a. If yes, what challenges have you experienced in using the system?

b. If yes, what benefits have you experienced from using the system?

Student Learning Goals

*6. What things have you done so far with respect to teachers' development of their Student Learning Goals? [If they don't understand what you're asking, you can offer examples such as: provide training, help select assessments, approve assessments, encourage teachers to work together, review documentation, set a due date.]

*a. What worked well?

*b. What challenges did you encounter?

*c. Was there anything about the forms, the terminology, or the process that was confusing to you or your teachers?

*If yes, what changes would you suggest to the forms, the terminology, or the process?

*d. Was there anything about the MDE training that was confusing to you or your teachers?

*If yes, how could it be improved?

*7. Has your building and/or the district developed a shared performance goal yet? [This is the student goal that will count for 5% of every teacher's component rating for student learning and achievement. For example, our school will improve overall performance on the math MCA from a rating of 61% proficient to 64% proficient on this year's exam.]

*a. If yes, how was this established?

8. How well did the process of developing Student Learning Goals align with . . .

a. District or building curricular goals?

b. District or building assessment goals?

c. District or building have staff development goals?

Overall

*9. Since implementation began in late summer, approximately how many hours per week have you spent on implementing the pilot?

*10. To what extent do you think a summative evaluator can facilitate implementation of the Model?

*11. Have you noticed any effects of implementing the Model on students or teachers so far? If yes, please describe.

*12. This is complex work; is there anything that would help you understand it better? If yes, please explain.

13. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience with the Model?

[Thank them for completing the interview. Remind them to complete the online survey if they haven't already done it]

Appendix K: Teacher Interview Protocol

Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model Pilot Teacher Interview Questions November 20, 2013

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. The purpose of the interview is to collect information about what is working well, what is challenging, and what you are learning about implementing the *Minnesota State Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model* (“the Model”) This is very complex work so feedback from individual teachers like you is critical to helping MDE understand how the Model is working and how it can potentially be improved.

We appreciate your candor. CAREI researchers will combine the information from your interview with information from other interviews in this district in addition to other districts across the state.

We will not use your name or the name of your school or district in any written or verbal reports based on this data. We may include a direct quote from your interview, but we would not include any information that could be used to identify you, your school, or your district.

May I record this interview? No one but members of the CAREI research team will have access to this recording or the transcript of the recording. All recordings and transcripts will be stored in locked offices in our center.

Do you have any questions for me before I begin?

Interviewer Instructions: Start the recorder and then state your name, the date, the school and the name of the interviewee before you ask the first question.

In case you need to show the interviewee what you’re talking about, a blank Individual Growth and Development Plan, a blank Point of Contact Documentation form, a blank Student Learning Goals Documentation form, and the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric are attached at the end of this interview.

Background

First, I will ask some background information about you. [If they seem uncomfortable providing this, explain that we need this information so that in our reports we can describe – in aggregate – the characteristics of the teachers we interviewed.]

- *1. Overall, how many years have you been teaching, not counting this year?
- *2. How many years in this district, not counting this year?
- *3. What subject(s) and grade(s) are you teaching this year?
- *4. Are you part-time?

*5. Are you tenured?

*6. Do you teach in more than one school in this district?

Teacher Practice

The following questions are related to your **Individual Growth and Development Plan (“the Plan”)**. Please respond to the questions from your perspective as a teacher, not as a peer reviewer.

*7. Have you developed your Plan?

a. [If NO, then gently ask] Can you tell me more about that? Is it difficult to find the time, do you need more information, or . . .?

b. [Skip to #13]

*8. [If YES] Tell me about that process. What did you do?

a. How did you use the *Performance Standards for Teacher Practice Rubric*, if at all?

b. What role did your peers play in developing your Plan?

c. Did your summative evaluator play a role in developing your Plan?

d. Were there other resources you found helpful? What were they?

*9. What benefits and/or challenges have you experienced in developing your Plan?

10. How have you used your Plan so far?

11. Have your *peer reviewer(s)* completed any points of contact yet?

a. If yes, what kind?

b. Have you seen the feedback?

c. How would you describe the experience?

12. Has your *summative evaluator* completed any points of contact yet? [New teachers should have had at least one by now.]

a. If yes, what kind?

b. Have you seen the feedback?

c. How would you describe the experience?

Student Learning Goals

Now I would like to focus on the Student Learning Goals component of the Model.

*13. Have you had an opportunity yet to develop your Student Learning Goals?

a. [If NO, then gently ask] Can you tell me more about that? Is it difficult to find the time, or do you need more information, or . . .?

b. [Skip to #17]

*14. [If YES] Tell me about the process. What did you do?

a. How did you select end-of-term assessments?

b. How did you establish mastery scores?

c. What kinds of assessments did you include?

d. How did you establish student starting points?

e. What role, if any, did your peers play in developing your Student Learning Goals?

f. Did your summative evaluator play a role in developing your Student Learning Goals?

g. What other resources, if any, did you find helpful in developing your Student Learning Goals?

*15. What benefits and/or challenges have you experienced in developing your Student Learning Goals?

*16. How have you used your Student Learning Goals so far, if at all?

Training and Resources

MDE facilitated training for teachers...

17. Was there anything about the MDE training for the Teacher Practice component and INDIVIDUAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN that was confusing for you? If yes, please describe. The Student Learning Goals MDE training? Please describe.

Forms

As part of implementing this Model there are required forms and procedures. I would like to ask you a couple of questions about how those have gone.

18. For your Plan, was there anything about the form, terminology, or process that was confusing for you? If yes, please describe. For the Student Learning Goals? If yes, please describe.

a. What changes would you suggest to make it easier to develop your Plan?
Student Learning Goals?

b. How well do you feel you understand the terminology used in the Plan? In the Rubric?
Student Learning Goals?

Overall

*19. This is complex work, is there anything that would help you understand it better?

[Thank them for completing the interview. Remind them to complete the online survey if they haven't already done it.]